

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 951

95

EA 006 867

AUTHOR Ginsburg, Alan L.; Killalea, J. Neil
TITLE Patterns of Federal Aid to School Districts.
Technical Analysis Paper.
INSTITUTION Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C. Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Planning and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 105p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Assessed Valuation; Comparative Analysis;
Compensatory Education; *Economic Disadvantage;
Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary
Education; Equalization Aid; Expenditure Per Student;
*Federal Aid; Lunch Programs; *Program Effectiveness;
Property Appraisal; *School Districts; State Federal
Aid; Tables (Data); *Urbanization

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the results of an analysis of the distribution of Federal aid to education, an analysis also intended to illuminate the conflicts that can result from allocating funds on the basis of different standards. The study classifies districts on three measures--family income, property wealth, and degree of urbanization--and examines the flow of Federal funds to priority districts in each group. Following an introduction, section 2 examines the methodology used in assessing Federal funding allocations. Sections 3-5 examine the district distribution for three of the major Federal funding categories: Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA), and State-Discretionary Federal Grants. Section 6 considers the impact of all Federal elementary and secondary school support in the aggregate, including some relatively small programs not included in the three major program areas. The final section discusses some implications of these analyses for Federal policy. An appendix contains printouts for individual States, for regions, and for the nation, displaying the per-pupil expenditure in detail for each Federal program component. (Author/MLF)

ED103951

Technical Analysis Paper

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PATTERNS OF FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Alan L. Ginsburg
with the assistance of
J. Neil Killalea

February 1975

EA 006 867

The Education Planning Staff
Office of the Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	iii
Summary	1
I. Introduction	4
II. Data and Methodology	8
III. Title I, ESEA: Aid for the Educationally Disadvantaged	19
IV. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas	26
V. Federally Funded State Discretionary Grant Programs	33
VI. Total Federal Aid to Education	39
VII. Conclusions: Implications for Federal Policy	43
Appendix	47

PREFACE

This study was carried out by the staff of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (OASPE), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It does not represent an official position of the Department; rather, it is intended to provide background and analytical support for consideration of the effectiveness with which Federal aid to education reaches the school districts of the United States.

Significant contributions, comments, and criticisms were made by Martin Kramer, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation/Education, and by a number of members of the OASPE staff: Kathryn M. Doolin, Nelson Ford, Sheldon L. Gnatt, Gerry L. Hendrickson, Susan Sargen, and Joan L. Turek; and by Charles M. Cooke, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation/Education, and Susan E. Hause of the Department's Legislative Liaison Office. Special acknowledgement and thanks are due to Jane Lee who, under the direction of Wray Smith, Director of Special Services of OASPE, produced the computer analyses that served as the basis for the entire study. Finally, B. J. Stone and others on the staff of the National Planning Association provided essential data on property wealth to supplement the data base.

SUMMARY

This study analyzes the distributional patterns of Federal aid to school districts. The question specifically addressed is whether funds for the major programs areas -- those that accounted for \$3.6 billion of the total of \$4.1 billion in elementary and secondary education aid in Fiscal Year 1974 -- reach the school districts that are most in need. The question is simply stated, but its analysis is complicated: there is no consensus on a single measure of school district needs that is best for all purposes, and different districts will be identified as needy depending on the measure employed. This study classifies districts on three measures -- by family income, by property wealth, and by degree of urbanization -- and examines the flow of Federal funds to priority districts of each group.

The conclusions of the study are presented first in terms of the individual program areas:

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is the largest Federal education program, providing \$1,719 million in FY 1974 to support compensatory education for educationally disadvantaged children. Title I aid is intended to be distributed to school districts that have concentrations of poor people. The results show that Title I's intent is implemented, and that districts of lower family income do receive these funds. In States in the more urbanized regions, however, Title I aid goes heavily to some districts -- the cities -- that are relatively property-rich; but in many such districts the

taxes on property must support other costly and extensive services in addition to education.

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA) provided \$593 million in FY 1974 to compensate school districts for the education of children whose parents are employed by or live on a Federal installation. As a whole, SAFA funds are aimed at, and received by, school districts of low tax base; are neutral with respect to the family income of a district; and are somewhat more heavily directed to suburban districts than to cities or rural places. The two main components of SAFA are allocated differently:

- . The 'A' portion is distinguished by its very heavy allocation to districts of low tax base. In addition, it is directed strongly to districts of lower family income.
- . The 'B' part is far less heavily concentrated on low tax base districts, and its funding to districts of higher family income is actually at relatively high rates.

The third major source of Federal funds is the so-called State-Discretionary Federal Grants totaling \$773 million in FY 1974 (including \$487 million for vocational education). Unlike the Title I and SAFA programs, which are allocated by Federal formula down to the local level, the grants are awarded to State governments, which then determine the allocation to sub-State jurisdictions, following only general Federal guidelines. Concern has been expressed that the States, in allocating these funds, may discriminate against urban areas. The findings fail to confirm this supposition, either at the national or regional level. The State discretionary programs channel funds more

heavily to urban districts in the more urban regions and to rural places only in the more rural regions. This aid is also generally channeled more heavily to low-income districts, which indicates that State allocations are reasonable in terms of this criterion as well. State discretionary funds are directed somewhat more heavily, however, to property-rich than to property-poor districts.

Thus, no one of the major aid programs is allocated in a way that satisfies the needs represented by the three groupings of districts studied: income, property wealth, and degree of urbanization. When these and certain other funds are aggregated, the resulting pattern of total Federal funding shows:

- . Overall, an emphasis on low-income districts
- . In the more urbanized States, an emphasis on the cities
- . In less urbanized States, an emphasis on rural districts.

Thus, in the aggregate, Federal aid to education appears to be quite well targeted on districts disadvantaged by lack of family income or by degree of urbanization; but the aggregate does not target nearly as well on districts disadvantaged by lack of taxable property.

I. INTRODUCTION

State court decisions in some fourteen States have declared unconstitutional those systems of school financing that make the level of education a child receives a function of the wealth of the district in which he lives. In States across the nation, and in the Federal government, attention has been strongly focused on the equity of the distribution of State and local funds to school districts. The distribution of Federal support to education has not yet received the same attention.

Part of the explanation for the lack of attention to Federal aid allocations may lie in the fact that the Federal government is, and traditionally has been, only a marginal participant in direct school finance, providing in FY 1974 only 7.3 percent of all revenues for public elementary and secondary education. Nonetheless, this aid of \$4.1 billion* represents a substantial expenditure by anyone's measure, and it is therefore important to know who benefits from this aid and whether these are the beneficiaries intended by the Congress. Moreover, by the nature of the Federal programs, the distribution of support among recipients is not uniform, so that Federal money can comprise a sizable percentage of the overall budget for particular places. Federal dollars, to the extent that they are targeted on national priority areas where unmet needs are great, can have a much greater impact than "regular" education dollars.

* Estimates from Digest of Educational Statistics: 1973, U.S. Office of Education, 1974, p. 124.

Moreover, the usefulness of information on the distribution of Federal funds is becoming much more apparent as a result of recent and proposed legislative actions in elementary and secondary education. For instance, it has been proposed to increase the discretionary authority which State governments now have over the allocation of Federal educational funds in certain existing program categories. To assess such proposals, which are also related to the more general issue of a consolidated grant approach to Federal support, it is important to know how equitably the States already use their existing discretionary authority over the allocation of Federal education funds. Also, during hearings that led to the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380) to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), debate in numerous program areas centered around the adequacy of present allocations in relation to relative district or pupil needs.

An analysis of the distribution of Federal dollars is technically very difficult, however. For some time it has not been possible to carry out a comprehensive analysis of the distribution of Federal aid within States because data was limited;* this is now less of a problem, with the recent availability of data from the Office of Education on

* The principal work in this area is a study of Federal aid distribution for school year 1966-1967 in five States. See Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits?, Joel S. Berke, Stephen K. Bailey, Alan K. Campbell, and Seymour Sacks, U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Government Printing Office, 1971. Follow-on studies using the same data base for the analysis of funding flows include: Joel S. Berke, Answers to Inequity: An Analysis of the New School Finance, McCutchan Press, 1974; and Joel S. Berke and Michael W. Kirst, Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs?, Lexington Books, Washington, D.C., Heath, 1972.

a nationally representative set of school districts which, combined with 1970 Census data, provides much more of the required information.

The more critical difficulties associated with this analysis arise, however, from the fact that the results obtained will vary with the measure used to assess the equity of the distribution of Federal aid to school districts. District needs are measurable in many ways, however, and there is no concensus on a single measure that is most appropriate; indeed, different measures would have to be used to reflect the different purposes of various Federal aid legislation.

More specifically, Federal programs currently fund a diversified set of activities, whose aims range from assisting children with particular educational problems to assisting school districts with particular fiscal problems. In the former case, the provision of Federally supported services is based on the assumption that such services to districts with needy children will help equalize the educational opportunities of recipient students in relation to the children not earmarked for special assistance. In the latter case, the Federal aid is aimed at equalizing the educational opportunities among the districts within States. This latter effort is also consistent with the growing concern of States and State courts over inequities within their school finance systems.* It would be particularly

* For a summary of reforms in ten States that have undergone major alteration in their school finance systems, see Major Changes in School Finance: Statehouse Scorecard, Lucile Musmanno and Alan C. Stauffer, Education Commission of the States, May 1974.

undesirable, therefore, for any program of Federal aid to schools to reinforce existing fiscal inequalities among school districts.

Thus, when the issue of equity arises, it soon becomes obvious that there are various standards, and that a distribution that would be equitable according to one standard can be at variance with the distribution resulting from another standard.

This paper reports on the results of an analysis of the distribution of Federal aid to education, an analysis which it is hoped will also illuminate the conflicts that can result between allocations of Federal funds generated on the basis of these different standards. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section II examines the methodology used by this paper in assessing Federal funding allocations. Sections III, IV, and V examine the district distribution for three of the major Federal funding categories. Section VI considers the impact of all Federal elementary and secondary school support in the aggregate, including some relatively small programs not included in the three major program areas; this section also presents data on school nutrition funding. The final section discusses some implications of these analyses for Federal policy.

An appendix contains printouts for individual States, for regions, and for the nation, displaying the per-pupil expenditure in detail for each Federal program component.

II. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The results of this study of Federal funds are influenced by the analytical procedures adopted by this study in at least three important ways. These include: (1) the ways school districts are to be classified for the purpose of this analysis, (2) the sources of the data used to trace Federal funds, and (3) the level of program and geographic detail shown in the tabular presentation. This section examines the choices made in each of these three areas.*

School districts could be categorized in many ways, such as relative percentage of children from low-income families, percentage of minority children, or average performance on standardized achievement tests. In light of the concerns discussed above and of limitations in available data, three district classifications have been chosen, each of which is indicative of different, although not necessarily wholly unrelated, characteristics of district needs. The primary results of the analysis -- average per-pupil expenditures from specified Federal programs -- are displayed separately for each district classification. The three classifications are:

* The present analysis differs in several important respects from those cited previously. First, the sample covers all States except Hawaii and the District of Columbia, which are composed of only a single district. Second, the studies cited used 1967 data for Federal expenditures and used 1960 Census data. The present study uses 1970 data for both. As a result of these and other differences, the present study reaches conclusions as to the adequacy of Federal aid patterns that often are significantly different from those in the studies cited earlier.



- . Median family income of the district
- . Equalized property value (per pupil) of the district
- . Degree of urbanization: center city, suburban, rural

Family income is a proxy measure for district educational performance levels, which cannot presently be directly measured by student test scores in a way that would provide consistent results across the nation and in all types of student groups. Family income is also one measure of a district's ability to finance educational services, both the general education program and special services.* Within this category, districts are divided into three groups, for each of which the average per-pupil Federal expenditure is presented: districts of lowest family income containing 25 percent of the students in each State, those districts containing the next 50 percent, and those containing the remaining 25 percent. The tables that follow also present an average per-pupil expenditure over all districts.

* The particular measure of family income selected for use in this study, that of the median value of family income in a district, is one of several possible choices. The median is widely used (e.g., in the U.S. Census) as an indicator of the income of the typical family in a geographic area. To measure extreme educational deprivation, however, it would probably be preferred to use the proportion of the district's population that is from families below the poverty level. To measure tax capacity by income, on the other hand, it would probably be preferred to use mean family income, since it is the average of total family income within an area. Mean family income is, however, well known to be disproportionately influenced by the income of wealthy families. These comments were suggested by James N. Fox of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education.

Equalized property value per pupil is, however, the more commonly used measure of district ability to support education. This index of fiscal capacity reflects the reliance of school districts on the property tax for more than 80 percent of all locally raised school revenues.* The State court findings referred to above are based on the uneven distribution of property wealth among districts. Critics of a property wealth measure of fiscal capacity cite its failure to consider that people ultimately pay taxes from their incomes. They also point to the fact that many cities, in contrast to suburbs and rural areas, must finance from their local tax base not only their educational systems but also a much higher level of non-educational services for all residents (and commuters), a requirement to which a per-pupil property value measure is insensitive. It is this disparity that is sometimes referred to as municipal overburden.** This classification is also considered in three groups: low 25 percent, middle 50 percent, and high 25 percent in terms of equalized property value (EPV) per average daily attendance (ADA). An average is also presented.

The third classification, degree of urbanization, can reflect certain dimensions of need for Federal support that may not be fully

* An estimate of 82 percent was calculated for 1971-1972 in Reforming School Finance, Robert D. Reischauer and Robert W. Hartman, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 6.

** For a discussion of the fiscal disparities between center-city and non-center-city districts, see: City Financial Emergencies: The Intergovernmental Dimension, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., 1973.

reflected by either of the two other criteria, as is suggested by the preceding paragraph. For instance, large cities tend to have many low-income and many relatively high-income families. A measure of average district income may fail to differentiate the cities, with their disproportionate numbers of low-income children with potentially greater educational problems, from other kinds of school districts with the same average income. The city grouping is also significant for those concerned that the property value measure overstates the ability of cities to finance education because of the issue of "overburden" on the tax base mentioned above. Moreover, districts that differ in degree of urbanization also, as will be seen, differ in the degree to which they require different types of Federal service. In this study, districts are distinguished in the tables, following U.S. Census definitions, as to whether they are primarily a center city; a suburb, defined as any part of a metropolitan area that is not a center city; or a non-metropolitan area (referred to as rural for convenience, even though the category includes some urbanized non-metropolitan areas). Within the center-city grouping, the largest center city in each State is reported separately.

The data to analyze the flow of Federal funds to districts for these three groupings is the combined "1970 Census Fourth Count -- 1970 Elementary-Secondary General Information Survey (ELSEGIS)" prepared by the U.S. Office of Education. This data base combines socioeconomic characteristics of districts developed from the U.S. Census

with staffing and financing information from the Office of Education's survey of school districts. The sample consists of 5065 school districts, selected from each of the 50 States and including the District of Columbia; for this study, Hawaii and the District of Columbia are omitted, since each is a single school district. The district equalized property values that are necessary for developing the classification of districts by wealth base per pupil were missing from these data sets and were obtained by a special data collection for all but six States.*

Survey data on school finances more current than 1970 were not available on a nationally representative basis. The current patterns of funding have been altered as a result of the passage of the Education Amendments of 1974. Although some of the changes are important for specific districts, the general underlying criteria for allocations (e.g., low income, presence of children of Federal employees, etc.) have remained the same in all cases. The 1970 data should be of sufficient accuracy for this study, which deals only with general allocative patterns of Federal funding for groups of particular types of districts.

* The six States are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Louisiana, Minnesota, and Wyoming. Since the subset of districts used for analyzing distributions by property wealth is less than the full sample, the table rows displaying the averages over the districts will differ somewhat between the subset and the full set.

Table I lists Federal expenditures for elementary and secondary education* for fiscal years 1970 and 1974. Three program components, numbered 1 through 3 on the table, have been singled out for special study because of their significance in the Federal budget and/or because of their importance for future Federal policy development. These programs are:

- (1) Title I, ESEA. This is the largest of all Federal programs at \$1,719 million in 1974. It is also of utmost importance for national educational policy because it is the principal program of Federal support to equalize the opportunities of educationally disadvantaged children.
- (2) School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA): This second largest program of Federal aid to education, \$593.4 million in FY 1974, supplies general-purpose support to school districts to offset diminished tax revenues resulting from the presence of non-taxable Federal property in their tax base.
- (3) State Discretionary Programs: This category, totaling \$773.4 million in FY 1974, includes all major programs in which, unlike ESEA and SAFA, Federal aid is directly allocated only to State-level governments,

* The total of \$3.8 billion shown in Table I differs from the figure of \$4.1 billion quoted in the Introduction. The difference is partly accounted for by the fact that the higher figure includes some programs, such as Head Start, that are not clearly elementary and secondary education as usually defined. In addition, Table I lists actual figures, while the Office of Education Digest, referenced earlier, contained estimates.

TABLE I

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
AID FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND TOTAL: FY 1970 and FY 1974
(\$ MILLIONS)

Federal Programs	1970	1974
1. Educationally Disadvantaged Children (Title I, ESEA).....	1339.1	1719.3
2. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas.....	520.6	593.4
3. State Discretionary Federal Programs		
. Vocational Education.....	376.3	486.7
. School Libraries (Title II, ESEA).....	42.5	90.3
. Supplementary Services		
Title III, ESEA	111.8	146.4
NDEA, Title V.....	19.0	
. Equipment and Minor Remodeling (NDEA, Title III)	37.2	50.0
SUBTOTAL.....	586.8	773.4
4. All Other Programs in ELSEGIS Sample <u>1</u> /.....	85.5	471.7
SUBTOTAL 1-4 (Aid for school districts)..	2532.0	3557.8
5. Other Elementary and Secondary <u>2</u> /	287.3	235.4
TOTAL (Elementary and Secondary).....	\$2819.3	\$3793.2

- 1/ Other programs of aid to school districts include Education of the Handicapped, Dropout Prevention, Bilingual Education, Emergency School Aid, Vocational Education Research, Follow Through, Drug Abuse, Environmental Education, Nutrition and Health, and Right to Read.
- 2/ Other programs of aid to elementary and secondary education include strengthening State Departments of Education, Education Research and Professional Development, Research and Training, and Civil Rights Advisory Services. These programs are not included in the present analysis.

with the State having discretion over the allocation of funds to its districts, subject only to general Federal approval. Included in this category are vocational education (State grant portion); Title II, ESEA (Libraries); Title III, ESEA (supplementary education centers); NDEA, Title III (equipment and minor remodeling); NDEA, Title V-A (guidance, counseling, and testing). Whether the States have used their discretionary authority responsibly in the allocation of these funds, particularly with respect to the cities, is a much debated issue.

In addition to these three major breakouts, Federal aid to education includes a number of other minor appropriation categories. The various programs of aid to school districts that are indicated in item 4 of Table I are included in the ELSEGIS data base for 1970. As can be seen, these amounted to only \$85.5 million in 1970, but increased to \$471.7 million in 1974. Further study would be needed to determine the degree to which any of the results of this study might be affected by differences in how these funds were distributed in 1974, compared with 1970.

Table I also shows, as item 5, other programs of education aid, most of which are expended at the State rather than at the district level. These programs are not included in the ELSEGIS data base; but

the effect of their omission is minimal, since this study is concerned with the distribution of Federal funds to school districts.

Finally, school districts also receive Federal funds for school lunch and special breakfast programs. Although child nutrition is a major funding category, \$408 million in 1974,* it is not a program of direct educational support, but rather a type of income support program in which the school is a convenient place for service delivery. School lunch funds are included in this study, therefore, only as a program separate from direct educational support.**

The Appendix contains, for each State, the breakouts of Federal funds among selected program areas and by type of district. Tables for individual States are excessively detailed for the development of broad patterns of Federal impact by type of district. On the other hand, assessing only national impacts would be excessively broad, masking important differences in fiscal impact that can arise. The present analysis represents a compromise between the State and national extremes, by examining data on Federal funding in detail for each of the four principal U.S. Census geographic regions: Northeast, Middle West, South, and West, defined as follows:

* The Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1974, Appendix, Office of Management and Budget, p. 206, includes school lunch (\$348 million) and school breakfast programs (\$60 million) in the \$408 million.

** This is in contrast to the previously cited studies of five States in 1966-1967, which treat the school lunch and milk category as part of the State discretionary grant programs. See, for example, Answers to Inequity, p. 135.

NORTHEAST	MIDWEST	SOUTH	WEST
Maine	Ohio	Delaware	Arkansas
New Hampshire	Indiana	Maryland	Louisiana
Vermont	Illinois	District of	Oklahoma
Massachusetts	Michigan	Columbia *	Texas
Rhode Island	Wisconsin	Virginia	Montana
Connecticut	Minnesota	West Virginia	Idaho
New York	Iowa	North Carolina	Wyoming
New Jersey	Missouri	South Carolina	Colorado
Pennsylvania	North Dakota	Georgia	New Mexico
	South Dakota	Florida	Arizona
	Nebraska	Kentucky	Utah
	Kansas	Tennessee	Nevada
		Alabama	Washington
		Mississippi	Oregon
			California
			Alaska
			Hawaii *

* Not included in this
study

The tables in this summary paper contain regional and national groupings which are generated by combining, for all the States in a region, all districts of a particular classification. For instance, a region's breakout of districts in the low 25 percent of property value would include all districts so classified within each of the States in that region. Average Federal expenditures per pupil are then computed for each region and the nation, weighted by the number of pupils in each district.*

* Mathematically, the average per-pupil Federal expenditure, f , for a particular district classification, D , in a particular region, R , is calculated as:

$$f_{D,R} = \sum_{s \in R} \sum_{d \in D,s} f_d \frac{A_d}{A_{D,R}}$$

where

- D = a particular district classification (e.g., low 25 percent in terms of family income)
- d = a particular district ($d \in D$ specifies that district d is one of the group of districts, D)
- f_d = average Federal grant per pupil to district d
- R = the specified region
- s = a State ($s \in R$ specifies that State s is in region R)
- A = average daily attendance (thus, $A_{D,R}$ is the total average daily attendance in all the districts in the classification D in region R)



III. TITLE I, ESEA: AID FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) provides funds intended to help those children who come to the educational environment bearing a disadvantage relative to the general student population. Under the criteria of the Title, the eligible children for purposes of funding are those who come from low-income families, those whose families receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and those whose education is managed by the States -- migrant, handicapped, and neglected and delinquent children. Since the primary aim of this study is to examine the distribution of funds to districts of varying kinds, the State-managed Title I programs are not included in the present analysis.

It is sometimes noted that children from low-income families are not necessarily educationally disadvantaged, and that children from homes of moderate or high wealth also can have disadvantages in the classroom. The use of a low-income allocation criterion in the Title I program for the educationally disadvantaged is justified, however, on two counts. First, it serves as a proxy measure for educational need, which presently is not measurable through more direct means, such as test scores, in a way that could be applied consistently throughout the nation. Studies* have shown, however, that low income explains between 50 and 60 percent of the variance in student test scores; there is therefore an important relationship

* For example, see Evaluation of Educational Achievement Test Measures as an Eligibility Criterion in the Better Schools Act Formula, Educational Testing Service, 1973, prepared for the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HEW.

between low income and educational disadvantage, even though a sizable variance remains to be explained by other than economic causes, which is to say that some educationally disadvantaged children come from wealthier homes. The second point is that children who are both educationally and economically disadvantaged could well be considered as a special Federal priority; the rationale is that the poor generally have less opportunity for preschool education or for remedial assistance outside the classroom once they have begun school.

The Title I grant entitlement is calculated to the county level on the basis of relative concentrations of children from low-income and AFDC families. (Data is not available at the national level on the distribution of eligible children in counties containing two or more school districts; accordingly, in these cases the State divides the county grants using the best data available to it on the distribution of eligible children.) The current formula, incorporated in the 1974 Amendments, differs in several respects* from the formula used in FY 1970, the year for which data is used in the present study.

-
- * The formula used in 1970 counted as eligible all children, ages 5-17, from families of annual income below \$2,000 based on 1960 Census figures, and children from families receiving AFDC payments of \$2,000 or more. The 1974 Amendments replaced the flat \$2,000 income criterion with the official Census definition of poverty (the Orshansky poverty line), which varies by family size (it equaled \$3,750 for a non-rural family of four in the 1970 Census year). The 1974 Amendments also reduce the AFDC children counted to two-thirds of the children from families receiving AFDC payments in excess of the poverty level. The FY 1970 formula multiplied the number of eligible children in each county by a factor of one-half the State or one-half the national per pupil expenditures, whichever was higher for each State. The rate of payment per pupil was uniform within each State as a result of the earlier formula; the new formula obtains a similar effect by somewhat different means.

Unpublished analyses* for a sample set of school districts have not shown, however, any particular type of district significantly helped or harmed by the new formula allocations relative to previous allocations. This also suggests that the overall patterns of allocations shown in this study are likely to be applicable to the new provisions.

The flow of Title I funds to local school districts is shown in Table II for the four regions and for the country as a whole. It is seen from the table that Title I funds are concentrated most heavily on districts of lowest family income. In all four regions and in the nation as a whole, these districts are funded at a per-pupil rate at least four times the rate of districts in the highest income category. The ratio of payments to low- versus high-income districts is nearly 7:1 in the Northeast, and is nearly 5:1 nationally. These patterns of distributions are the expected result of the low-income criterion of payment used in the Title I formula.

The table also shows, however, that in many parts of the country Title I funds are much less concentrated in the districts with low tax base than in the districts of low income. For States of the Northeast, the average rate of Title I payments to districts with the lowest equalized property value per pupil is only one-third of the per pupil rate paid to the highest. In the Midwest and the West, Title I grants are distributed nearly uniformly across districts of all tax bases. Only in the Southern States does a strong positive association

* By the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation and by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress in support of hearings on the Education Amendments of 1974.

TABLE II: AVERAGE TITLE I, ESEA EXPENDITURES, BY REGION AND TYPE OF DISTRICT,
1970 (\$ PER PUPIL)

DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION	NATIONAL	NORTHEAST	SOUTH	MIDWEST	WEST
Median Family Income					
Low - 25%	39.9	37.1	68.2	22.8	36.6
Middle - 50%	22.8	27.1	30.9	18.0	18.0
High - 25%	8.2	5.7	15.6	5.2	7.3
Average	23.5	24.2	36.4	16.0	20.0
Equalized Property Value Per ADA:					
Low - 25%	22.9	13.4	50.4	12.9	19.0
Middle - 50%	21.9	22.0	33.0	16.9	17.9
High - 25%	24.2	40.2	24.7	15.8	18.6
Average	22.7	24.4	35.3	15.6	18.4
Degree of Urbanization:					
Center City	32.6	64.0	29.4	26.1	20.0
Largest	41.9	79.3	31.1	33.3	21.3
Suburban *	11.0	9.8	17.7	7.6	11.5
Non-Metro **	31.7	13.8	49.6	18.8	31.9
Average	23.5	24.2	36.4	16.0	20.0

* Includes all non-center-city metropolitan areas.

** Includes rural and all other non-metropolitan areas.

SOURCE: U.S. Census-ELSEGIS 1970 Data Base (Supplemented)

between Title I payments and district tax base appear. In the South, the rate of Title I payments per pupil to low tax base districts is twice that to the highest. When the data is aggregated for the nation as a whole, these regional differences disappear, and it appears that Title I funds are distributed nearly uniformly across districts of different tax base.

The pattern of distribution of Title I grants to districts of different urban types also varies markedly by region of the country, as seen in the last part of Table II. Among States in the Northeast, Title I grants in 1970 were concentrated heavily on districts serving center-city areas. The per-pupil payment in center cities is almost five times that in rural districts and more than six times that in the suburbs; and in the largest cities the per-pupil rate is eight times that of suburban areas, reflecting the dominance of New York City. The general pattern of Title I funding in the Midwest is not unlike that in the Northeast, except in degree: Center cities are funded at almost three and one-half times the rate of the suburbs, and at half again the rate of rural areas. Just as the Northeast and the Midwest exhibit similar patterns of Title I funding, the South and the West share a pattern of distribution (a pattern that is quite different from that shared by the Northeast and the Midwest). Rural districts in the South and the West dominate the allocations, being funded at one and one-half times the rate in the center cities and at three times the rate in suburban areas. When the data are aggregated across the nation as a whole, center cities and rural areas receive

about equal per-pupil rates, which are about three times the rate received in suburban areas.

As is clear from the table, the impact of Title I in terms of district income is quite different from its impact in terms of district tax base. It should also be noted that these differences are related to the degree of district urbanization. Districts serving center-city areas tend to be richer in property per-pupil than districts in other parts of a State, although many such cities contain high percentages of children from low-income families and are heavy recipients of Title I funds. This occurs particularly in the major urban centers in the Northeast and accounts for the strong correlation between Title I funding rates and property wealth of districts in that part of the country. In the Midwest and West, Title I money is somewhat more evenly distributed among center city and rural districts. Additionally, rural districts in the Midwest and the West are often rich agricultural farm lands and are not as property poor relative to the cities as are the rural districts in the Northeast. Finally, Title I funding in the South reflects the concentration of low-income families in rural districts that are also comparatively poor on a property criterion. Hence, only in the South is there a strong inverse correlation between Title I funding and district wealth base.

These results have an important bearing for both Federal and State finance policies. In the drive to equalize educational opportunities, it is necessary to consider whether the aim is to equalize educational opportunities of fiscally poor districts or economically poor families.

Our analysis thus far has been of a Federal program designed to equalize the educational opportunities of poor families. Many States are undertaking extensive revision in their school finance systems, focusing primarily on patterns of inequities resulting from differences in local property wealth. Although the well-known Serrano ruling in the California State Supreme Court claims that property-based financing discriminates against children in low tax base districts, the results in Table II suggest that, in some parts of the country, the lowest tax base districts may not contain the children who are neediest by the criterion of family income. Thus, concentration of all equalizing efforts on property-poor districts could well fail to provide equal opportunities to children in income-poor districts. This kind of result confirms the caution expressed in the Introduction, that a distribution that is equitable under one standard can create inequities when judged from another standard.

IV. SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (SAFA)

The SAFA program, under Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, provides funds to districts in relation to the number of children within a district from families who reside or work on Federal property. One justification for SAFA support is to assure an adequate level of educational services for children of Federal employees, but the rationale expressed most widely for this program is to compensate districts for lost tax revenues because of the presence of non-taxable Federal property in their tax base.*

The payment of Federal support to a district because it provides education for children whose parents are employed by the Federal government has been controversial, almost from the initial enactment of this legislation in 1950. Each Administration since that of Eisenhower has proposed cutbacks in the SAFA budget and each has seen its proposals rejected by Congress. Part of the popularity of this program is attributable to its broad distribution among Congressional districts, and part to the fact that it is general-purpose aid which the recipient school districts can use as they see fit. Critics of the program cite as justification for its reduction that Federal installations, far from constituting a burden, are often highly prized as being beneficial to the overall economic health of the communities in which they are located. As evidence of these benefits, certain areas of high

* The rationales for the SAFA program are examined in: School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, The Battelle Memorial Institute, for the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, Ninety-First Congress, Second Session, 1970.

Federal impact are frequently pointed to as among the wealthiest places in the country.* The complex problem of estimating the net impact of Federal installations on particular districts is beyond the scope of this analysis. This study does, however, address the issue of the relative needs of the districts that receive SAFA.

Most SAFA payments, about 88 percent, are made to local districts under either Section 3A ('A' payments) for children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property; or Section 3B ('B' payments) for children with a parent employed on Federal property but who do not reside on Federal property. Each SAFA 'B' child is counted for purposes of payment as one-half that of an 'A' child, since the 'A' child represents, in theory, a double loss of property to the district through place of employment and residence, while the 'B' child represents a loss only in place of employment. The rate of payment is determined by a complex set of criteria that reflect national, State, or local per-pupil expenditures, whichever is the greater.**

The district-level distribution of SAFA 'A' and 'B' payments and the total SAFA payments,*** which include several other minor components

* The school districts surrounding Washington, D.C., for example, are heavy recipients of SAFA funding. Among these districts are some of the districts with the highest average income in the country, including Arlington, Virginia, and Montgomery County, Maryland.

** For the specific formula, see P.L. 93-380, Title III.

*** The column marked "Total SAFA" includes, in addition to 874A and B, other 874 funds as well as funds from P.L. 81-815. The breakdown of total SAFA funds into A, B, and other 874 funds is based on data received from the Office of Education.

of the program, are presented in Table III for the regional and national breakouts shown in the previous section. Overall, the distribution of SAFA 'A' payments appears to coincide relatively closely with district needs expressed by either the income or the tax base criterion. In all four regions, 'A' grants are concentrated heavily on low tax base districts. Nationally, the rate of SAFA 'A' payments between low to high tax base districts is in the ratio of 8:1.

In the West, a region of heavy 'A' payments, and in the Northeast, SAFA 'A' funds are concentrated on districts of low family incomes. A more uniform distribution of 'A' grants across district income classes occurs in the South and the Midwest, the two regions in which per-pupil rates are lowest. The national distribution shows that, in the aggregate, SAFA 'A' funds are channeled heavily to districts of low income, with a ratio of nearly 6:1 between low- and high-income districts, reflecting the proportion of total 'A' funding going to the Western region with its heavy concentration of Federal property. Additionally, school districts located in the suburbs or rural places generally receive the highest per-pupil 'A' funding, presumably because Federal installations in these areas more frequently house those they employ than do installations in the cities.

In contrast, payments under the 'B' part of the program do not result in funding to needy districts to the same degree as do 'A' payments, using either the income or the property wealth criterion. The 'B' rate of compensation is somewhat higher in low than in high tax

TABLE III: AVERAGE SAFA EXPENDITURES BY REGION AND TYPE OF DISTRICT, 1970
(\$ PER PUPIL)

DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION	NATIONAL			NORTHEAST			SOUTH			MIDWEST			WEST		
	SAFA 874 A	SAFA 874 B	Total SAFA	SAFA 874 A	SAFA 874 B	Total SAFA	SAFA 874 A	SAFA 874 B	Total SAFA	SAFA 874 A	SAFA 874 B	Total SAFA	SAFA 874 A	SAFA 874 B	Total SAFA
Median Family Income															
Low - 25%	4.1	4.9	9.7	3.2	4.7	8.0	0.5	3.6	4.4	1.6	2.6	4.9	9.9	8.2	
Middle - 50%	1.7	7.8	10.3	0.8	4.0	4.9	0.3	10.9	12.0	0.8	4.1	6.0	4.2	11.7	
High - 25%	0.7	7.6	9.4	0.2	2.8	3.1	0.5	13.5	15.5	1.2	3.5	5.1	0.7	10.5	
Average	2.0	7.0	9.9	1.2	3.9	5.2	0.4	9.7	11.0	1.1	3.6	5.5	4.7	10.5	
Equalized Property Value Per ADA:															
Low - 25%	5.0	9.0	15.9	3.1	4.6	8.0	0.9	10.8	13.2	3.9	4.8	9.6	11.1	15.5	
Middle - 50%	0.7	7.2	8.7	0.8	3.9	4.7	0.4	10.1	11.5	0.2	3.9	5.2	1.3	10.9	
High - 25%	0.6	5.0	5.9	0.3	3.0	3.3	0.1	8.7	8.9	0.1	2.4	3.0	1.7	6.5	
Average	1.7	7.1	9.8	1.2	3.9	5.2	0.4	9.9	11.3	1.1	3.8	5.8	3.8	11.0	
Degree of Urbanization															
Center City	0.8	7.7	9.2	1.5	3.8	5.3	0.0	11.2	12.3	0.0	4.5	5.3	1.4	10.8	
Largest	0.3	5.7	6.7	0.6	3.4	3.9	0.0	8.5	8.5	0.0	5.5	6.4	0.3	6.4	
Suburban *	2.9	8.3	12.7	0.5	3.8	4.4	0.5	16.5	18.3	0.7	3.7	5.6	8.9	12.4	
Non-Metro **	1.8	5.0	7.6	2.6	4.3	6.9	0.5	5.3	6.3	2.3	2.8	5.4	2.7	7.5	
Average	2.0	7.0	9.9	1.2	3.9	5.2	0.4	9.7	11.0	1.1	3.6	5.5	4.7	10.5	

* Includes all non-center-city metropolitan areas

** Includes rural and all other non-metropolitan areas.

SOURCE: U.S. Census-ELSEGIS 1970 Data Base (Supplemented)

base districts of each region and nationally, but not to the extent of the 'A' program. The rate of 'B' payments between low and high tax base districts is in the ratio of less than 2:1 nationally compared to 8:1 for 'A's. There is also a sharp contrast between the patterns of 'A' and 'B' funding when viewed by districts classified according to family income. Nationally and in all regions, 'A' funding was applied heavily to low-income districts; but 'B' payments, nationally and in every region except the Northeast, went most predominately to districts in the middle 50 percent and the highest 25 percent in terms of family income. Whether Federal installations in these districts are a boon or a burden cannot be determined from these data, but there is no evidence that the districts that receive 'B' payments because of Federal employment are disadvantaged on the basis of family income.

With the exception of the Western suburbs, the cities and suburbs of each region fare much better relative to rural areas under the 'B' part of the program, where the eligibility criterion is place of employment and not residency, than under the 'A' part.

Much of the effort at reforming SAFA has been limited to the 'B' part of the program, consistent with the results of the above flow of funds analysis that found the 'B' payments going at higher rates per pupil to districts of more questionable needs. Because of the residency requirement of the 'A' program, a high proportion of its eligibles is found on large military installations in less densely

populated areas where the Federal installation is a significant factor in creating a lower tax base for the area.

One of the major forces opposing cutbacks in 'B' funding is the cities, which argue that, because they receive relatively low funding under the 'A' category, they should receive 'B' program funding at existing or even higher levels. To argue in this way, however, is to consider only a part of the problem of allocating Federal aid to education. For instance, as was seen in the preceding section, Title I funds are distributed much more heavily to cities than to suburbs or rural areas. This distribution pattern is consistent, however, with the purpose of Title I and with the relatively greater concentrations of needy children in cities. More generally, this leads to the observation that the most rational and efficient allocations of Federal funds are achieved through programs that aim directly, rather than indirectly, at target populations or goals.

The potential of the SAFA program to contribute to the equalization of education opportunities across school districts has been highlighted recently as a consequence of new legislative provisions that allow States to use SAFA funding as an offset to their own equalization aid.* Previously, many districts received a "double payment" for their "lost" tax base -- once from Federal support from SAFA and a second time from the State as part of their State's equalization aid

* Specifically, P.L. 93-380, Title III states: "If a State has in effect a program of State aid for free public education for any fiscal year, which is designed to equalize expenditures..., payments under this title for any fiscal year may be taken into consideration by such State in determining the relative...financial resources available to local educational agencies in that State..."

program. To be eligible to use this offset, State programs of aid now must be "designed to equalize expenditures" according to criteria established by the Commissioner of Education. The legislation does not, however, specify the criteria that should be applied as the standard of State equalization. Property wealth and family income are both supportable choices, but programs acceptable on one criterion may, as prior results demonstrate, fail in many States to meet the other.

V. FEDERALLY FUNDED STATE DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAMS

Although the Federal government determines the distribution of Title I and SAFA payments down to a local or sub-State level, many other Federal programs control the grant distribution only to the State level, and the States then determine the proper further allocation of funds to districts within the State, subject only to general Federal approval. The programs in which State discretionary funding is currently permitted tend to provide functional support for selected educational activities rather than support for a particular target population, such as Title I, ESEA for the educationally disadvantaged. A presumed advantage of this procedure is that States, knowing better than the Federal government the relative needs of their districts, can arrive at better allocations. How satisfactory the procedure is depends on the degree to which each State exercises its discretionary authority in a responsible manner.

The programs considered in this grouping are divided for purposes of this study into grants for vocational education and "Other" discretionary grants for elementary and secondary education. The vocational education program is displayed separately, because it is currently the third largest program of Federal support, comprising \$486.7 million in FY 1974. The "Other" category of the table includes grants totaling \$286.7 million in FY 1974 for auxiliary services, covering Title II, ESEA - libraries; Title III, ESEA - supplementary educational services for innovation; Title III of the National Defense Educational

Act (NDEA) for strengthening instruction in critical subjects; and Title V-A, NDEA for guidance and counseling.* This "Other" grouping is consistent with the fact that new legislation will consolidate the above four activities into a single grant authority effective in FY 1976.

The governments of a number of States have been perceived by many observers as dominated by the interests of rural areas, relative to urban or suburban areas. One of the principal concerns, therefore, regarding this category of State discretionary programs has been the potential for States to discriminate against urban areas in their allocations. This concern has been widely expressed as one argument against any further shift of funding authority from the Federal to the State level through an educational revenue-sharing type of authority.** As evidence in support of this concern, some have cited the historical patterns of school aid in many States that are said to have favored rural over urban districts. It should be noted, however, that a thorough evaluation of the equity of the distribution of school aid cannot rest on a simple comparison of total dollars allocated, but would have to take into account such factors as the relatively lower levels of taxable property base available per pupil to support education in many rural districts.

-
- * Grants for the education of the handicapped, totaling some \$47.5 million in FY 1974, should also be counted in the "Other" category of State discretionary money. These grants do not appear separately in the ELSEGIS data base, however, and are therefore not included in Table IV. These funds are included in the Summary Table (next section).
- ** The recent 1974 Amendments to ESEA cited above represent a consolidation of some grant authorities of State discretionary programs that are consistent with a revenue-sharing philosophy.

Table IV shows the distribution of the State grant programs by the district breakouts previously used: median family income, equalized property value, and degree of urbanization. These breakouts make it possible to test the thesis of center-city discrimination in the States' grant allocations, and also permit an assessment of the allocations by other criteria. In making this assessment, some plausible assumptions exist as to, generally, which types of districts need which group of services, although it may not be apparent how to measure the relative magnitude of needs among districts. Vocational educational services might be thought to be most needed among children in lower income districts, whose populations have traditionally not entered the white collar occupations, and in rural districts, where manual trade occupations are of greater economic importance. The auxiliary services funded under the "all other" category could be justified for any of the three district groupings. For instance, books (Title II, ESEA) and equipment (NDEA, Title III) might be needed by the suburbs where fast growth has often not permitted auxiliary services to catch up, by the older cities which require replacement of older educational materials, and by rural areas where such materials may be considered to be prohibitively expensive in view of the small population served. The innovative programs under Title III, ESEA could be justified for any group of districts, although the less entrenched bureaucracy in the newer suburban areas might show a greater openness to innovation.

TABLE IV - AVERAGE STATE DISCRETIONARY EXPENDITURES, BY REGION AND TYPE OF DISTRICT, 1970 (\$ PER PUPIL)

District Classification	NATIONAL			NORTHEAST			SOUTH			MIDWEST			WEST	
	Voc.Ed.	Other	Total	Voc.Ed.	Other	Total	Voc.Ed.	Other	Total	Voc.Ed.	Other	Total	Voc.Ed.	Other
Median Family Income														
Low - 25%	4.3	3.9	8.2	2.5	4.6	7.0	8.2	4.4	12.6	4.5	3.7	8.3	2.6	3.1
Middle - 50%	3.1	4.5	7.7	1.8	4.7	6.4	4.6	4.8	9.3	3.5	4.8	8.3	2.8	3.9
High - 25%	2.0	4.0	6.0	0.6	3.2	3.8	3.2	4.8	8.0	2.4	4.6	7.0	1.7	3.4
Average	3.2	4.2	7.4	1.6	4.3	5.9	5.1	4.7	9.8	3.5	4.5	8.0	2.5	3.6
Equalized Property Value Per ADA:														
Low - 25%	2.5	3.7	6.2	1.2	3.2	4.4	4.9	4.4	9.3	2.3	3.7	6.0	2.0	3.4
Middle - 50%	3.1	4.4	7.4	1.4	4.4	5.7	5.5	5.0	10.6	3.3	4.9	8.2	2.3	3.4
High - 25%	3.3	4.2	7.5	2.3	5.3	7.6	3.5	4.4	8.0	4.3	4.5	8.9	2.8	2.9
Average	3.0	4.2	7.1	1.6	4.3	5.9	4.9	4.7	9.6	3.3	4.5	7.8	2.3	3.3
Degree of Urbanization:														
Center City	4.0	5.3	9.3	3.4	7.0	10.4	4.9	3.6	8.6	5.0	6.7	11.6	3.2	4.0
Largest	3.9	5.6	9.4	3.5	6.4	9.9	4.5	3.3	7.8	5.2	7.5	12.8	2.6	4.3
Suburban *	2.0	3.6	5.5	0.9	3.3	4.2	3.7	4.7	8.5	2.2	3.9	6.1	1.7	2.8
Non-metro **	4.0	4.2	8.2	1.5	3.6	5.1	6.0	5.0	11.0	3.9	3.6	7.5	2.7	4.2
Average	3.2	4.2	7.4	1.6	4.3	5.9	5.1	4.7	9.8	3.5	4.5	8.0	2.5	3.6

* Includes all non-center-city metropolitan areas

** Includes rural and all other non-metropolitan areas.

SOURCE: U.S. Census/ELSEGIS 1970 Data Base (Supplemented)

The results of Table IV fail to support a hypothesis of State discrimination against center-city districts in allocations of Federal funds. Nationally and for each region except the South, the cities, including the largest cities in each State, are funded at higher than the average per-pupil rates. This is true for both the vocational education program and the "Other" State discretionary program categories. In the heavily urbanized region of the Northeast and in the relatively urban Midwest, the cities are funded at about twice the per-pupil rate of the suburbs or rural districts. The advantage that generally applies to cities is not as great in the less urban Western region.

In general, rural districts fare considerably better than the suburbs in the distribution of vocational education monies. Suburbs and rural areas receive comparable allocations of auxiliary service support comprising the "Other" category, except in the West, where suburbs receive markedly less. These relationships are consistent with the generally lower income population in rural areas and the special circumstances in the newer, fast-growth suburbs.

By directing funding to urban places in the more urban regions and to rural places in the more rural regions, the State allocations are also related to the relative income levels in the various districts. The rate of aid to low-income districts relative to high-income districts is higher in the Northeast and Southern parts of the country than in the Midwest or West. This is the result of generally higher support under the vocational education program to low-income places.

Finally, property-rich districts generally receive more State discretionary funds per pupil than property-poor districts. Although the differences are not large, the positive association between level of funding and district tax capacity again illustrates the conflicts among different funding criteria.



VI. TOTAL FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The three program areas examined in the preceding sections account for more than 80 percent of Federal elementary and secondary education support to school districts in FY 1974. We now wish to examine the implications of Federal support in the aggregate. In order to do so, it is appropriate to consider also two other kinds of support:

- . The programs shown as item 4 of Table I provide support in a variety of ways (see the footnotes in Table I for a listing). In FY 1970 the total in these programs was \$85.5 million; in FY 1974 the total came to \$471.7 million.
- . Schools also receive considerable assistance from the Federal government to assist in improving the nutrition of school children, through the school lunch and milk programs. Although an adequate lunch can have a positive effect on the educational performance of a child who would otherwise have to do without, the Federal programs are more appropriately considered as support of income rather than of education. These funds are included in this report for purposes of completeness; but they are treated as a category separate from direct education assistance.

The Summary Table thus represents the total of these funds. Again, it presents per-pupil Federal spending for the four regions and for the nation as a whole. The column headed Total Federal Education is the sum of the three program areas and the miscellaneous programs discussed immediately above (those included in item 4 of Table I). The column headed School Lunch includes the various nutritional programs discussed above.

The aggregate distributions of funds per pupil, both inclusive and exclusive of the school lunch program, are heavily directed to

SUMMARY TABLE: AVERAGE FEDERAL EDUCATION AND SCHOOL LUNCH EXPENDITURES, BY REGION AND TYPE OF DISTRICT, 1970
(\$ PER PUPIL)

District Classification	NATION						EAST						MIDWEST						WEST					
	Total Fed. Education			Total Fed. School & Lunch			Total Fed. Education			Total Fed. School & Lunch			Total Fed. Education			Total Fed. Education			Total Fed. Education			Total Fed. Education		
Median Family Income																								
Low - 25%	69.8	11.1	80.9	62.2	3.0	65.2	96.6	17.5	115.2	43.5	8.6	52.1	79.8	13.9	91.7									
Middle - 50%	51.2	8.0	59.2	48.0	2.6	50.6	61.4	12.5	73.9	42.7	7.1	49.8	53.9	9.4	63.3									
High - 25%	28.6	6.5	35.0	14.1	2.6	16.7	52.0	10.2	62.2	19.4	5.6	25.0	30.3	7.3	37.6									
Average	50.2	8.4	58.6	43.1	2.7	45.8	67.9	13.4	81.3	37.1	7.1	44.2	54.5	10.0	64.4									
Equalized Property Value Per ADA:																								
Low - 25%	53.0	8.9	61.9	28.9	3.0	31.9	82.2	15.3	97.5	32.3	7.6	39.9	70.7	10.0	80.7									
Middle - 50%	47.9	8.0	55.9	39.0	2.6	41.6	68.0	13.1	81.1	40.1	6.7	46.7	47.2	9.8	56.9									
High - 25%	48.0	6.0	56.0	66.3	2.5	68.7	50.0	11.9	61.9	34.9	7.1	42.0	43.9	10.5	54.4									
Average	49.2	8.2	57.4	43.3	2.7	46.0	67.1	13.3	80.4	36.8	7.0	43.8	52.2	10.0	62.2									
Degree of Urbanization:																								
Center City	68.0	7.7	75.7	103.3	2.0	105.3	61.8	11.8	73.6	62.2	6.8	69.0	54.0	10.1	64.0									
Largest	76.6	6.0	82.6	117.2	1.3	118.5	59.5	12.2	71.7	75.2	7.5	82.7	50.0	5.5	55.5									
Suburban *	34.3	6.4	40.8	20.6	2.6	23.2	56.9	9.6	66.5	23.0	6.1	29.1	45.7	8.8	54.4									
Non-Metro **	56.1	11.2	67.2	28.6	3.8	2.4	76.2	16.2	92.4	26.1	48.5	44.6	67.5	11.6	79.1									
Average	50.2	8.4	58.6	43.1	2.7	45.8	67.9	13.4	81.3	37.1	7.1	44.2	54.5	10.0	64.4									

* Includes all non-center-city metropolitan areas

** Includes rural and all other non-metropolitan areas

SOURCE: U.S. Census/PLANSIS 1970 Data Base (supplemented)

districts of lower average income in all parts of the country. The rate of per-pupil payments between the lowest to the highest median income districts is in the range of 2:1 in the South and the Midwest, about 2-1/2:1 in the West, and 4:1 in the Northeast. Nationally, it is about 2-1/2:1. Only in the Midwest is the per-pupil expenditure for the middle 50 percent close to the rate for the low 25 percent in family income. In directing Federal funds to income-poor districts, property-poor districts receive little more than property-rich districts when aggregated over the nation as a whole. This national pattern is, however, a composite, and a smoothing out, of diverse regional patterns in which Federal aid is disequalizing with respect to low-wealth districts in the Northeast, neutral in the Midwest, and equalizing only in the South and West. This confirms once more the need to examine funding patterns according to more than any single criterion and in greater detail than an aggregate national analysis provides.

The relative impact of total Federal aid on the cities has much to do with regional circumstances, and indicates the inadequacy of looking at only the national aid distribution. Total benefits are skewed towards the cities in the more major urban States of the Northeast and Midwest, particularly so in the Northeast. In the South and West they are skewed to rural places. Suburban districts do not fare particularly well (in terms of average rate of payment per pupil) in any part of the country. These regional patterns of impact by degree of urbanization closely correspond to the pattern of location of lower income families within States.

Generally, the allocation of school lunch support assists low-income rather than high-income districts, and rural over urban places. It is relatively neutral with regard to funding of districts by differing levels of taxable property. This greater assistance to low-income districts is the result of the fact that the allocation formula for the school lunch program includes an income-need factor. The heavier allocations to rural areas may be at least partly explained by the greater distances from school to home in the less urbanized areas.

VII. CONCLUSIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL POLICY

This study has presented an analysis of the patterns of Federal funding allocations by type of district, where districts have been categorized by their relative median family income, relative property wealth, and relative degree of urbanization. The principal results are:

- . In the urban regions -- particularly in the Northeast but also in the Midwest -- Title I aid, which is equalizing among districts on the basis of family income, is disequalizing with respect to districts defined on the basis of property tax base. In the West, the effect of Title I aid is neutral with respect to equalizing districts defined on property wealth per pupil. Only in the South is Title I aid equalizing across districts defined as needy on both criteria. Furthermore, Title I aid targets on the cities in the Northeast and Midwest, but on rural districts in the South and the West -- a distributional pattern which is in keeping with the targeting on low-income districts, whose locations differ region by region.
- . Nationally, SAFA aid tends to be targeted very heavily on areas of low tax base. It is neutral, however, with respect to districts' income, and it is directed more heavily to suburban districts than to cities

or rural districts. The 'A' and 'B' portions of SAFA are distributed in quite different ways among districts. 'A' funding is concentrated at high rates on districts that are needy on either the basis of family income or property tax base. In contrast, 'B' funds are less heavily concentrated on relatively low tax base districts and are actually funded at higher than average rates to districts of higher average income. This suggests that efforts to reform SAFA might be directed at the 'B' portion of the program.

- . The State discretionary Federal grant programs generally reflect, but to a lesser extent, the Title I pattern of aid. The observed patterns of allocations do not support the widely expressed fear that State governments are discriminating against center cities in the exercise of their authority in these grant programs. Nationally, and in all regions except the South, the center cities receive per-pupil spending that is at least equal to that of the suburbs and rural areas; in the Northeast, the per-pupil spending in the center cities is twice that of either the suburbs or the rural areas. Rural areas tend to be favored over suburbs from these programs in total, but the auxiliary services portion of these funds is directed almost as heavily to suburbs as to rural areas.

- . Generally, school lunch support is allocated to low-income rather than high-income districts, and to rural rather than urban places. Its distribution is relatively neutral with respect to property tax base. The greater assistance to low-income districts results from the fact that the allocation formula for the school lunch program includes an income-need factor. The heavier allocations to rural areas may be explained, at least in part, by the greater distances from school to home in the less urbanized areas, and the consequently greater need for the school to serve lunch.
- . When all sources of aid to school districts for elementary and secondary education are aggregated, funds are seen to be heavily directed to districts of lower average income in all regions of the country. On the criterion of property wealth, however, the pattern is different: total Federal aid is directed heavily to property-rich districts in the Northeast, is neutral in the Midwest, and is directed to property-poor districts in the South and the West. When districts are viewed by degree of urbanization, it is seen that total benefits are directed towards urban areas in the more urbanized States, and to rural districts in the South and the West. Suburban districts do not fare particularly well (in terms of average rate of payment per pupil) in any part of the country. These regional patterns of impact of total Federal

aid by degree of urbanization closely correspond to the pattern of the location of lower income families within States.

A principal conclusion from these results is that no single Federal aid program is allocated in a way that satisfies the needs represented by all three groupings of districts studied: income, property wealth, and degree of urbanization. Nonetheless, the patterns depicted here reflect the important tradeoffs among types of perceived needs that must be considered in a balanced Federal policy. The present pattern of total Federal funding -- with emphasis on lower income districts, generally; on the cities in the more urban States; and on rural districts in less urbanized States -- is one compromise that may meet quite well the needs of children disadvantaged by lack of family income, but not nearly as well the needs of districts disadvantaged by lack of taxable property.

This conclusion has important implications in the consideration of any move toward a Federal policy of consolidated grants providing general educational support and away from categorical support targeted for particular educational purposes. The results here strongly indicate that any simple general-aid formula -- allocating solely on the basis of the number of pupils, for instance -- would almost certainly fail to approximate the present pattern of overall Federal allocations, and in all probability would create major and unintended disruptions in allocations within States. Follow-on studies might explore the feasibility of developing a single formula that would avoid the difficulties suggested above.

APPENDIX

The tables of this appendix show Federal educational expenditures for each State, each region, and for the entire nation. Per-pupil expenditures are shown for each of the major educational program categories discussed in the body of this paper. The district classifications are identical to those in the summary tables in the text.

The appendix tables augment the text tables in several ways. In addition to the SAFA payments under Parts 'A' and 'B', the sum of other SAFA payments is included, so that all the components of total SAFA expenditures are presented. Furthermore, the various State discretionary expenditures, other than vocational education, are broken out and shown in their component parts. Finally, those Federal educational programs not included in the major categories discussed in the text are presented, labeled "All Other".



FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

52

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	22.91	1	5.01	9.00	1.84	15.85	1	2.54	0.84	1.55	1.09	0.19	3.66	6.20	1	8.05	53.01	8.86	61.87
MIDDLE 50%	21.92	1	0.69	7.20	0.81	8.70	1	3.05	0.86	2.41	0.95	0.17	4.39	7.44	1	9.83	47.89	7.98	55.87
HIGH 25%	24.21	1	0.58	5.04	0.32	5.94	1	3.25	0.64	2.35	1.04	0.20	4.22	7.47	1	10.35	47.97	8.01	55.98
AVERAGE	22.74	1	1.74	7.11	0.95	9.80	1	2.97	0.80	2.18	1.01	0.18	4.17	7.14	1	9.52	49.19	8.20	57.40

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	32.59	1	0.84	7.66	0.75	9.24	1	3.95	0.96	3.22	0.96	0.17	5.31	9.26	1	16.95	68.04	7.69	75.73
LARGEST CC	41.90	1	0.25	5.68	0.77	6.70	1	3.85	1.13	3.41	0.88	0.15	5.57	9.42	1	18.59	76.61	6.02	82.63
SURURBAN *	10.96	1	2.91	8.28	1.11	12.30	1	1.95	0.78	1.62	0.96	0.19	3.56	5.50	1	5.57	34.33	6.44	40.77
NON METRO **	31.67	1	1.79	4.96	0.83	7.58	1	4.00	0.71	2.17	1.14	0.20	4.21	8.21	1	8.59	56.06	11.17	67.23
AVERAGE	23.45	1	2.01	6.99	0.92	9.92	1	3.15	0.80	2.21	1.02	0.19	4.22	7.37	1	9.45	50.19	8.37	58.56

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	37.08	I	3.22	4.73	0.02	7.97	I	2.45	0.90	2.42	1.20	0.06	4.58	7.03	I	10.12	'62.20	3.00	65.20
LNW 25%	27.06	I	0.75	4.03	0.09	4.87	I	1.75	0.97	2.56	0.99	0.13	4.66	6.41	I	9.62	47.97	2.59	50.56
MIDDLE 50%	5.65	I	0.18	2.78	0.15	3.10	I	0.61	0.67	1.44	0.99	0.12	3.22	3.83	I	1.54	14.12	2.61	16.73
HIGH 25%																			
AVERAGE	24.21	I	1.22	3.89	0.09	5.20	I	1.64	0.88	2.24	1.04	0.11	4.28	5.92	I	7.73	43.06	2.70	45.76

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

	64.02	1	1.49	3.79	0.0	5.28	1	3.38	0.94	4.78	1.22	0.06	6.99	10.38	1	23.61	103.28	1.97	105.25
CENTER CITY	64.02	1	1.49	3.79	0.0	5.28	1	3.38	0.94	4.78	1.22	0.06	6.99	10.38	1	23.61	103.28	1.97	105.25
LARGEST CC	79.28	1	0.55	3.35	0.0	3.90	1	3.50	0.86	4.19	1.30	0.04	6.39	9.88	1	24.11	117.18	1.30	118.48
SUBURBAN *	9.77	1	0.51	3.77	0.13	4.41	1	0.86	0.91	1.37	0.89	0.12	3.29	4.15	1	2.31	20.64	2.55	23.19
NON METRO **	13.77	1	2.57	4.27	0.08	6.92	1	1.52	0.76	1.48	1.20	0.14	3.59	5.11	1	2.78	28.58	3.84	32.42
AVERAGE	24.21	1	1.22	3.89	0.09	5.20	1	1.64	0.88	2.24	1.04	0.11	4.28	5.92	1	7.73	43.06	2.70	45.76

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

54

[illegible]

	22.76	1	1.55	2.60	0.69	4.85	1	4.52	0.77	1.44	1.30	0.22	3.73	8.26	1	7.68	43.54	8.58	52.12
LOW 25%	22.76	1	1.55	2.60	0.69	4.85	1	4.52	0.77	1.44	1.30	0.22	3.73	8.26	1	7.68	43.54	8.58	52.12
MIDDLE 50%	17.98	1	0.78	4.07	1.14	5.99	1	3.47	1.05	2.38	1.17	0.22	4.82	8.28	1	10.48	42.73	7.09	49.82
HIGH 25%	5.18	1	1.21	3.47	0.39	5.07	1	2.40	0.87	2.26	1.18	0.26	4.58	6.98	1	2.15	19.38	5.57	24.96
AVERAGE	15.98	1	1.08	3.55	0.84	5.47	1	3.47	0.94	2.11	1.20	0.23	4.49	7.95	1	7.70	37.10	7.08	44.18

	12.89	1	3.90	4.76	0.95	9.61	1	2.31	0.86	1.25	1.40	0.21	3.73	6.04	1	3.79	32.34	7.58	39.92
LOW 25%	12.89	1	3.90	4.76	0.95	9.61	1	2.31	0.86	1.25	1.40	0.21	3.73	6.04	1	3.79	32.34	7.58	39.92
MIDDLE 50%	16.93	1	0.23	3.91	1.07	5.21	1	3.26	1.12	2.48	1.10	0.20	4.89	8.15	1	9.76	40.05	6.65	46.70
HIGH 25%	15.77	1	0.09	2.43	0.53	3.04	1	4.34	0.67	2.27	1.28	0.30	4.51	8.86	1	7.18	34.85	7.10	41.95
AVERAGE	15.63	1	1.11	3.75	0.91	5.77	1	3.29	0.94	2.12	1.22	0.23	4.50	7.80	1	7.62	36.82	6.99	43.82

CENTER CITY	26.06	I	0.01	4.46	0.83	5.31	I	4.96	1.45	3.91	1.00	0.32	6.68	11.64	I	19.20	62.21	6.75	68.96
LARGEST CC	33.29	I	0.03	5.46	0.95	6.44	I	5.22	2.12	4.25	0.79	0.38	7.54	12.76	I	22.69	75.18	7.47	82.55
SUBURBAN *	7.58	I	0.73	3.67	1.19	5.60	I	2.17	0.80	1.74	1.17	0.23	3.94	6.11	I	3.73	23.02	6.10	29.12
NON METRO **	18.83	I	2.26	2.76	0.42	5.44	I	3.94	0.73	1.29	1.40	0.16	3.58	7.53	I	4.27	36.06	8.48	44.55
AVERAGE	15.98	I	1.08	3.55	0.84	5.47	I	3.47	0.94	2.11	1.20	0.23	4.49	7.95	I	7.70	37.10	7.08	44.18

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	68.15	I	0.46	3.60	0.31	4.37	I	8.22	0.69	2.54	0.92	0.22	4.37	12.59	I	11.49	'96.61	18.53	115.15
LOW 25%	68.15	I	0.46	3.60	0.31	4.37	I	8.22	0.69	2.54	0.92	0.22	4.37	12.59	I	11.49	'96.61	18.53	115.15
MIDDLE 50%	30.94	I	0.32	10.89	0.82	12.03	I	4.56	0.63	2.73	1.20	0.21	4.77	9.33	I	9.14	61.43	12.49	73.92
HIGH 25%	15.63	I	0.51	13.54	1.48	15.52	I	3.21	0.78	2.84	1.01	0.18	4.81	8.03	I	12.80	51.98	10.18	62.16
AVERAGE	36.42	I	0.40	9.73	0.86	10.99	I	5.14	0.68	2.71	1.08	0.21	4.68	9.82	I	10.64	67.86	13.42	81.29

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	50.36	I	0.86	10.76	1.57	13.18	I	4.40	0.69	2.30	1.17	0.20	4.36	9.26	I	9.41	82.23	15.26	97.48
MIDDLE 50%	33.02	I	0.39	10.11	1.01	11.52	I	5.53	0.73	3.09	1.04	0.18	5.04	10.57	I	12.91	68.02	13.05	81.07
HIGH 25%	24.71	I	0.10	8.65	0.13	8.88	I	3.54	0.57	2.70	0.95	0.22	4.44	7.98	I	8.45	50.02	11.88	61.90
AVERAGE	35.28	I	0.43	9.91	0.93	11.28	I	4.88	0.68	2.79	1.05	0.19	4.72	9.59	I	10.92	67.07	13.31	80.38

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	29.40	I	0.31	11.24	1.06	12.31	I	4.94	0.57	1.80	1.02	0.22	3.61	8.55	I	11.51	61.78	11.82	73.60
LARGEST CC	31.08	I	0.00	8.54	0.0	8.54	I	4.51	0.66	1.54	0.89	0.16	3.25	7.76	I	12.12	59.51	12.21	71.72
SUBURBAN *	17.69	I	0.49	16.52	1.26	18.27	I	3.74	0.75	2.65	1.15	0.15	4.71	8.45	I	12.53	56.94	9.58	66.52
NON METRO **	49.60	I	0.47	5.28	0.56	6.31	I	6.02	0.68	3.04	1.06	0.23	5.01	11.03	I	9.26	76.20	16.18	92.38
AVERAGE	36.42	I	0.40	9.73	0.86	10.99	I	5.14	0.68	2.71	1.08	0.21	4.68	9.82	I	10.64	67.86	13.42	81.29

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

56

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
O
P
Q
R
S
T
U
V
W
X
Y
Z
[
\
]
_
`
a
b
c
d
e
f
g
h
i
j
k
l
m
n
o
p
q
r
s
t
u
v
w
x
y
z
{
}
~
!
@
#
\$
%
&
'
(
)
*
+,-
=
<, >
[,]
_, ^
~, /
:
; ,
"
'
~
!@# \$%& '()*+,-= <> [] _ ^ ~ / : ; , " ' ~ !

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
LOW 25%	36.55	1	9.88	8.23	1.49	19.61	1	2.62	0.63	1.45	0.78	0.19	3.05	5.67	1	17.94	79.77	13.90	93.68																																																																																	
MIDDLE 50%	18.00	1	4.22	11.68	1.37	17.27	1	2.78	0.72	2.24	0.79	0.17	3.92	6.70	1	11.89	53.87	9.38	63.25																																																																																	
HIGH 25%	7.27	1	0.65	10.48	2.52	13.65	1	1.65	0.74	1.61	0.76	0.25	3.36	5.01	1	4.36	30.29	7.32	37.60																																																																																	
AVERAGE	19.95	1	4.74	10.52	1.69	16.95	1	2.46	0.70	1.88	0.78	0.19	3.56	6.02	1	11.52	54.45	10.00	64.44																																																																																	

	18.97	1	11.05	15.51	4.27	30.83	1	1.99	0.69	1.61	0.94	0.20	3.44	5.44	1	15.47	70.71	9.98	80.69
LOW 25%	18.97	1	11.05	15.51	4.27	30.83	1	1.99	0.69	1.61	0.94	0.20	3.44	5.44	1	15.47	70.71	9.98	80.69
MIDDLE 50%	17.92	1	1.31	10.92	1.06	13.28	1	2.29	0.73	1.89	0.60	0.18	3.40	5.68	1	10.25	47.15	9.79	56.94
HIGH 25%	18.63	1	1.70	6.46	0.52	8.68	1	2.75	0.56	1.38	0.78	0.16	2.88	5.63	1	10.93	43.87	10.51	54.38
AVERAGE	18.36	1	3.84	10.95	1.73	16.52	1	2.33	0.68	1.69	0.73	0.18	3.28	5.61	1	11.73	52.22	10.02	62.24

CENTER CITY	20.02	I	1.38	10.81	1.01	13.21	I	3.16	0.78	2.36	0.75	0.10	3.99	7.15	I	13.58	53.96	10.08	64.04
LARGEST CC	21.25	I	0.31	6.39	1.78	8.49	I	2.55	0.74	2.97	0.57	0.04	4.33	6.88	I	13.38	50.01	5.51	55.52
SUBURBAN *	11.46	I	8.91	12.40	1.91	23.22	I	1.73	0.65	1.15	0.71	0.25	2.77	4.50	I	6.48	45.66	8.77	54.44
NON METRO **	31.91	I	2.68	7.52	2.16	12.35	I	2.68	0.68	2.37	0.92	0.22	4.19	6.88	I	16.31	67.45	11.63	79.08
AVERAGE	19.95	I	4.74	10.52	1.69	16.95	I	2.46	0.70	1.88	0.78	0.19	3.56	6.02	I	11.52	54.45	10.00	64.44

01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	86.30	I	0.03	2.98	0.0	3.02	I	7.65	0.66	0.27	0.92	0.45	2.30	9.95	I	3.38	102.65	19.08	121.73
LOW 25%	86.30	I	0.03	2.98	0.0	3.02	I	7.65	0.66	0.27	0.92	0.45	2.30	9.95	I	3.38	102.65	19.08	121.73
MIDDLE 50%	40.96	I	0.01	6.41	0.0	6.42	I	8.08	0.73	2.67	1.68	0.28	5.36	13.44	I	6.89	67.71	14.79	82.51
HIGH 25%	25.89	I	0.0	15.10	0.0	15.10	I	8.15	0.58	1.58	1.33	0.29	3.79	11.94	I	12.68	65.62	9.00	74.62
AVERAGE	48.53	I	0.01	7.73	0.0	7.74	I	7.99	0.68	1.80	1.40	0.32	4.20	12.19	I	7.46	75.92	14.42	90.34

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%
MIDDLE 50%
PROPERTY VALUE UNAVAILABLE FOR THIS STATE

AVERAGE

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	31.88	I	0.01	12.92	0.0	12.93	I	7.06	0.35	2.26	1.39	0.29	4.28	11.35	I	10.54	66.70	10.53	77.23
LARGEST CC	31.48	I	0.0	6.22	0.0	6.22	I	4.08	0.20	0.0	0.86	0.30	1.37	5.44	I	2.70	45.84	18.94	64.79
SUBURBAN *	39.06	I	0.02	4.76	0.0	4.78	I	12.14	0.73	1.15	1.67	0.28	3.83	15.97	I	6.50	66.32	14.12	80.44
NON METRO **	62.03	I	0.02	6.00	0.0	6.02	I	6.78	0.24	1.80	1.30	0.36	4.31	11.09	I	6.10	85.25	16.76	102.01
AVERAGE	48.53	I	0.01	7.73	0.0	7.74	I	7.99	0.68	1.80	1.40	0.32	4.20	12.19	I	7.46	75.92	14.42	90.34

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

58

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

AVERAGE

[illegible]

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%
MIDDLE 50%
(* * * PROPERTY VALUE UNAVAILABLE FOR THIS STATE * * *)

AVERAGE

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	18.32	1	0.83	19.42	0.0	20.25	1	16.97	0.71	1.65	0.97	0.14	3.47	20.44	1	6.03	65.04	8.59	73.63
LARGEST CC	14.97	1	0.0	28.20	0.0	28.20	1	0.0	0.74	2.94	0.66	0.14	4.48	4.48	1	5.28	52.94	14.62	67.55
SUBURBAN *	14.39	1	1.89	6.44	0.0	8.33	1	3.13	0.87	3.11	0.95	0.30	5.22	8.36	1	1.73	32.81	6.78	39.59
NON METRO **	31.01	1	19.26	9.74	13.17	42.17	1	8.42	0.85	1.01	0.87	0.36	3.10	11.52	1	36.49	121.20	9.80	131.00
AVERAGE	19.69	1	6.27	10.22	3.50	19.98	1	7.63	0.83	2.22	0.93	0.28	4.27	11.90	1	11.93	63.50	7.99	71.49

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS--ELSGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

60

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***#INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	24.34	1	20.40	10.59	1.38	32.36	1	2.84	0.48	1.39	0.40	0.20	2.48	5.32	1	13.01	'75.03	14.96	89.99
MIDDLE 50%	17.18	1	2.49	12.14	0.56	15.18	1	2.70	0.42	2.04	0.28	0.07	2.81	5.51	1	11.71	49.58	9.73	59.31
HIGH 25%	4.64	1	1.10	8.84	0.82	10.76	1	1.69	0.51	0.79	0.39	0.13	1.82	3.51	1	1.90	20.81	6.98	27.79
AVERAGE	15.83	1	6.62	10.92	0.83	18.37	1	2.48	0.46	1.57	0.34	0.12	2.48	4.96	1	9.58	48.75	10.35	59.10

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	11.71	I	21.22	13.41	1.58	36.20	I	1.69	0.52	1.08	0.28	0.17	2.05	3.74	I	7.79	59.44	8.18	67.62
MIDDLE 50%	18.70	I	1.85	11.45	0.70	14.00	I	2.49	0.46	2.08	0.27	0.10	2.92	5.40	I	9.84	47.94	10.73	58.67
HIGH 25%	14.23	I	1.54	7.40	0.34	9.28	I	3.26	0.38	1.04	0.52	0.10	2.03	5.29	I	10.86	39.66	11.78	51.44
AVERAGE	15.83	I	6.62	10.93	0.83	18.37	I	2.48	0.46	1.57	0.34	0.12	2.48	4.96	I	9.58	48.75	10.35	59.10

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	22.62	I	2.62	11.15	0.0	13.77	I	3.45	0.44	2.83	0.20	0.05	3.51	6.97	I	14.09	57.45	10.52	67.97
LARGEST CC	25.10	I	0.61	5.48	0.0	6.09	I	3.57	0.67	4.36	0.27	0.0	5.30	8.86	I	13.76	53.82	2.36	56.18
SUBURBAN *	10.52	I	9.77	11.74	1.41	22.93	I	1.88	0.48	0.93	0.38	0.16	1.95	3.83	I	5.71	42.99	9.27	52.26
NON METRO **	26.30	I	0.27	3.90	0.0	4.16	I	2.75	0.37	0.91	0.64	0.08	2.00	4.75	I	19.17	54.38	17.67	72.06
AVERAGE	15.83	I	6.52	10.93	0.83	18.37	I	2.48	0.46	1.57	0.34	0.12	2.48	4.96	I	9.58	48.75	10.35	59.10

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

62

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

63

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	31.45	I	7.40	7.13	0.0	14.53	I	1.70	0.87	0.48	0.22	0.05	1.62	3.31	I	15.58	64.88	1.41	66.29
MIDDLE 50%	7.71	I	0.04	3.47	0.0	3.52	I	1.28	0.53	0.56	0.57	0.19	1.86	3.14	I	2.99	17.36	1.92	19.28
HIGH 25%	4.51	I	0.0	0.28	0.0	0.28	I	0.62	0.27	0.35	0.77	0.28	1.67	2.29	I	1.08	8.16	1.44	9.60
AVERAGE	12.85	I	1.87	3.59	0.0	5.46	I	1.22	0.55	0.49	0.53	0.18	1.75	2.97	I	5.66	26.94	1.68	28.62

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

	CENTER CITY	29.35	I	6.19	4.84	0.0	11.03	I	1.90	0.83	0.66	0.53	0.06	2.08	3.98	I	13.95	58.30	1.27	59.57
LARGEST CC.		44.22	I	0.0	5.37	0.0	5.37	I	2.15	0.0	2.79	0.0	0.0	2.79	4.93	I	15.02	69.54	0.0	69.54
SUBURBAN *		5.07	I	0.05	4.11	0.0	4.16	I	0.78	0.39	0.60	0.55	0.21	1.76	2.54	I	2.27	14.05	1.71	15.75
NON METRO *		7.47	I	0.0	0.80	0.0	0.80	I	1.26	0.53	0.0	0.48	0.28	1.29	2.55	I	1.84	12.66	2.16	14.83
AVERAGE		12.85	I	1.87	3.59	0.0	5.46	I	1.22	0.55	0.49	0.53	0.18	1.75	2.97	I	5.66	26.94	1.68	28.62

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

64

0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99

22

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	

[illegible]

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.
*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	1	0.74	3.58	0.0	4.32	I	7.47	0.66	4.07	0.78	0.18	5.70	13.17	I	11.13	'61.23	15.34	76.57
LOW 25%	32.60	I	0.74	3.58	0.0	4.32	I	7.47	0.66	4.07	0.78	0.18	5.70	13.17	I	11.13	15.34	76.57
MIDDLE 50%	19.99	I	0.23	10.85	0.39	11.47	I	3.48	0.67	2.47	1.11	0.39	4.65	8.13	I	19.15	9.24	67.98
HIGH 25%	17.10	I	1.68	11.62	3.40	16.69	I	3.47	0.31	2.75	0.93	0.21	4.20	7.67	I	49.83	8.84	100.13
AVERAGE	22.42	I	0.72	9.23	1.04	10.99	I	4.48	0.58	2.94	0.98	0.30	4.80	9.27	I	24.81	10.66	78.16

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

	22.07	1	2.34	24.08	4.17	30.60	1	3.96	0.81	4.29	1.30	0.14	6.53	10.49	1	9.43	72.60	10.29	82.89
LOW 25%	22.07	1	2.34	24.08	4.17	30.60	1	3.96	0.81	4.29	1.30	0.14	6.53	10.49	1	9.43	72.60	10.29	82.89
MIDDLE 50%	20.80	1	0.27	5.44	0.0	5.71	1	4.74	0.55	2.07	0.80	0.21	3.64	8.38	1	35.06	69.94	10.88	80.82
HIGH 25%	26.02	1	0.0	1.94	0.0	1.94	1	4.47	0.39	3.33	1.04	0.63	5.39	9.85	1	19.70	57.52	10.60	68.12
AVERAGE	22.42	1	0.72	9.23	1.04	10.99	1	4.48	0.58	2.94	0.98	0.30	4.80	9.27	1	24.81	67.50	10.66	79.16

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	22.88	I	0.0	6.55	0.0	6.55	I	2.52	0.98	0.66	0.13	0.22	1.99	4.51	I	29.97	63.91	13.28	77.19
LARGEST CC	23.01	I	0.0	7.88	0.0	7.88	I	2.46	0.98	0.79	0.0	0.18	1.95	4.42	I	33.22	68.52	13.18	81.70
SUBURBAN *	19.37	I	0.20	7.01	0.0	7.21	I	3.76	0.46	2.22	1.06	0.19	3.93	7.69	I	32.25	66.52	8.54	75.06
NON METRO **	27.17	I	1.72	13.42	2.96	18.09	I	6.10	0.67	4.64	1.07	0.48	6.86	12.96	I	11.71	69.93	13.41	83.34
AVERAGE	22.42	I	0.72	9.23	1.04	10.99	I	4.48	0.58	2.94	0.98	0.30	4.80	9.27	I	24.81	67.50	10.66	78.16

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

TITLE	I	874A	874B	S	A	F	A	OTHER	TOTAL	I	IVOC	ED	TITLE	II	III	ESEA	TITLE	IV	ED	STATE	DISCRETIONARY	TITLE	ED	TOTAL	ALL	OTHER	TOTAL	FED	EDUC	SCHOOL	LUNCH	TOTAL	FED	EDUC	PLUS	SCHOOL	LUNCH	
ESEA	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	65.88	I	0.19	3.99	1.73	5.91	I	6.67	0.66	0.0	0.60	0.33	1.60	8.27	I	0.21	80.27	19.46	99.73
MIDDLE 50%	28.40	I	0.00	8.23	0.68	8.92	I	8.75	0.68	2.06	1.04	0.29	4.07	12.82	I	2.07	52.20	15.61	67.81
HIGH 25%	10.22	I	0.15	15.55	1.95	17.66	I	3.99	1.00	1.58	1.42	0.13	4.13	8.12	I	1.23	37.24	12.93	50.16
AVERAGE	33.22	I	0.09	9.00	1.26	10.35	I	7.04	0.76	1.42	1.02	0.26	3.47	10.51	I	1.39	55.48	15.90	71.38

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	43.78	I	0.19	8.71	1.74	10.64	I	7.63	0.67	0.70	1.07	0.33	2.77	10.41	I	1.60	66.43	16.75	83.18
MIDDLE 50%	36.16	I	0.08	9.77	1.67	11.52	I	6.71	0.72	1.90	0.78	0.31	3.71	10.43	I	1.10	59.21	16.02	75.23
HIGH 25%	16.77	I	0.0	7.94	0.0	7.94	I	7.20	0.91	1.23	1.47	0.08	3.70	10.90	I	1.79	37.41	14.69	52.10
AVERAGE	33.22	I	0.09	9.05	1.27	10.40	I	7.07	0.76	1.43	1.02	0.26	3.47	10.54	I	1.40	55.56	15.87	71.43

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	25.87	I	0.0	12.25	1.94	14.18	I	11.04	0.96	0.87	1.09	0.17	3.09	14.13	I	1.29	55.46	15.91	71.38
LARGEST CC	25.23	I	0.0	8.82	0.0	8.82	I	11.87	1.10	1.70	0.84	0.0	3.64	15.51	I	2.12	51.68	17.86	69.55
SUBURBAN *	12.26	I	0.14	15.89	1.83	17.86	I	5.23	0.93	1.75	1.46	0.21	4.35	9.58	I	1.01	40.72	12.91	53.63
NON METRO **	45.61	I	0.09	4.67	0.78	5.53	I	6.65	0.61	1.44	0.79	0.31	3.16	9.80	I	1.62	62.57	17.34	79.91
AVERAGE	33.22	I	0.09	9.00	1.26	10.35	I	7.04	0.76	1.42	1.02	0.26	3.47	10.51	I	1.39	55.48	15.90	71.38

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	13.58	I	11.75	13.14	1.54	26.44	I	7.69	0.67	9.92	2.00	0.32	12.91	20.80	I	10.83	71.66	6.11	77.77
MIDDLE 50%	15.91	I	0.19	8.93	0.0	9.12	I	2.63	0.46	2.10	1.54	0.23	4.33	6.96	I	9.46	41.45	6.76	48.21
HIGH 25%	41.12	I	0.57	6.28	0.0	6.85	I	2.29	1.26	1.07	1.11	0.16	3.59	5.89	I	16.78	70.63	9.27	79.90
AVERAGE	21.63	I	3.17	9.32	0.38	12.88	I	3.86	0.71	3.79	1.55	0.24	6.29	10.15	I	11.63	56.30	7.22	63.52

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	9.66	1	0.22	9.34	0.0	9.56	1	2.51	0.15	3.22	0.82	0.27	4.45	6.97	1	1.89	28.07	5.61	33.68
LARGEST CC	9.66	1	0.22	9.34	0.0	9.56	1	2.51	0.15	3.22	0.82	0.27	4.45	6.97	1	1.89	28.07	5.61	33.68
SUBURBAN *	13.48	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.70	0.64	0.0	0.43	0.28	1.35	2.05	1	2.77	18.30	6.05	24.35
NON METRO **	23.57	1	3.68	9.55	0.45	13.69	1	4.13	0.80	3.97	1.68	0.23	6.69	10.82	1	13.27	61.35	7.49	68.84
AVERAGE	21.63	1	3.17	9.32	0.38	12.88	1	3.86	0.71	3.79	1.55	0.24	6.29	10.15	1	11.63	56.30	7.22	63.52

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

CMRCF. U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

68

[illegible]

22

22

	15.36	1	0.00	1.33	0.05	1.39	1	2.26	1.07	1.62	0.83	0.17	3.69	5.95	1	2.08	24.78	6.96	31.74
LOW 25%	15.36	1	0.00	1.33	0.05	1.39	1	2.26	1.07	1.62	0.83	0.17	3.69	5.95	1	2.08	24.78	6.96	31.74
MIDDLE 50%	22.97	1	0.15	6.14	2.32	8.62	1	4.62	2.06	2.11	0.68	0.10	4.95	9.56	1	13.29	54.44	7.93	62.37
HIGH 25%	8.46	1	0.02	2.43	0.04	2.48	1	4.47	0.82	2.68	0.45	0.12	4.07	8.53	1	2.27	21.75	6.51	28.26
AVERAGE	17.44	1	0.08	4.01	1.18	5.28	1	3.99	1.51	2.13	0.66	0.12	4.41	8.40	1	7.73	38.85	7.33	46.18

[illegible]

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99

[illegible]

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

63

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	15.95	1	0.00	3.21	0.70	3.91	1	2.88	0.20	2.49	1.50	0.55	4.74	7.62	1	2.02	29.50	9.22	38.72
LOW 25%	15.95	1	0.00	3.21	0.70	3.91	1	2.88	0.20	2.49	1.50	0.55	4.74	7.62	1	2.02	29.50	9.22	38.72
MIDDLE 50%	13.04	1	0.04	2.52	0.14	2.70	1	2.42	0.63	2.08	1.56	0.19	4.46	6.88	1	8.48	31.10	6.89	37.99
HIGH 25%	6.39	1	0.0	0.79	0.52	1.31	1	3.03	0.21	1.34	1.45	0.18	3.19	6.21	1	1.82	15.73	8.38	24.11
AVERAGE	12.10	1	0.02	2.26	0.37	2.65	1	2.68	0.42	2.00	1.52	0.28	4.21	6.90	1	5.20	26.85	7.85	34.70

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	16.53	I	0.01	1.83	0.0	1.84	I	1.74	0.75	2.05	1.09	0.18	4.08	5.81	I	13.28	37.46	5.41	42.87
LARGEST CC	15.46	I	0.02	6.32	0.0	6.35	I	0.0	1.44	0.0	2.95	0.0	4.39	4.39	I	9.47	35.67	2.38	38.05
SUBURBAN *	8.61	I	0.04	2.75	1.14	3.93	I	2.22	0.30	1.85	1.56	0.25	3.95	6.18	I	2.00	20.72	8.16	28.88
NON METRO **	11.59	I	0.02	2.18	0.0	2.20	I	3.84	0.25	2.08	1.82	0.39	4.54	8.39	I	1.51	23.69	9.53	33.21
AVERAGE	12.10	I	0.02	2.26	0.37	2.65	I	2.68	0.42	2.00	1.52	0.28	4.21	6.90	I	5.20	26.85	7.85	34.70

**INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.
 **INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.
 SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	LOW 25%	MIDDLE 50%	HIGH 25%	AVERAGE
1	27.87	21.72	12.65	21.00
2	0.0	0.12	0.00	0.06
3	0.81	3.60	6.08	3.52
4	0.54	0.13	0.0	0.20
5	1.35	3.84	6.09	3.78
6	1	1	1	1
7	2.95	1.57	1.35	1.86
8	0.14	0.25	2.26	0.72
9	0.03	0.45	2.47	0.85
10	0.56	1.33	1.66	1.22
11	0.02	0.07	1.03	0.30
12	0.75	2.10	7.42	3.10
13	3.70	3.67	8.78	4.95
14	1	1	1	1
15	0.07	0.27	0.21	0.21
16	32.99	29.51	27.76	29.94
17	12.03	13.07	10.85	12.26
18	45.02	42.59	34.60	42.20

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

	16.23	I	0.18	7.05	0.04	7.28	I	0.94	1.38	2.55	1.78	0.50	6.22	7.16	I	0.06	30.73	12.76	43.49
LOW 25%	16.23	I	0.18	7.05	0.04	7.28	I	0.94	1.38	2.55	1.78	0.50	6.22	7.16	I	0.06	30.73	12.76	43.49
MIDDLE 50%	20.92	I	0.03	2.35	0.38	2.76	I	2.03	0.78	0.41	1.15	0.32	2.67	4.70	I	0.39	28.77	11.99	40.76
HIGH 25%	26.60	I	0.0	1.75	0.0	1.75	I	2.50	0.0	0.09	0.77	0.07	0.93	3.43	I	0.00	31.78	12.37	44.15
AVERAGE	21.17	I	0.06	3.38	0.20	3.64	I	1.88	0.74	0.87	1.21	0.30	3.12	5.00	I	0.21	30.01	12.28	42.29

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	18.19	1	0.00	4.55	0.0	4.56	1	1.11	2.73	2.18	2.40	0.90	8.21	9.32	1	0.09	32.17	13.78	45.95
LARGEST CC	19.91	1	0.02	3.40	0.0	3.42	1	2.89	8.43	5.12	0.93	2.43	16.92	19.81	1	0.27	43.40	13.46	56.86
SUBURBAN *	20.64	1	0.0	2.41	0.07	2.48	1	0.63	0.02	1.75	0.98	0.54	3.29	3.92	1	0.21	27.24	12.22	39.46
NON METRO **	22.01	1	0.09	3.48	0.29	3.87	1	2.43	0.25	0.18	0.90	0.04	1.37	3.80	1	0.25	29.93	11.77	41.69
AVERAGE	21.00	1	0.06	3.52	0.20	3.78	1	1.86	0.72	0.85	1.22	0.30	3.10	4.95	1	0.21	29.94	12.26	42.20

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS--EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

71

1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99
100	100

[illegible][illegible]

CENTER CITY	29.30	I	0.01	14.39	0.0	14.40	I	0.0	0.45	2.46	0.31	0.0	3.22	3.22	I	21.42	68.34	4.50	72.84
LARGEST CC	28.74	I	0.0	18.17	0.0	18.17	I	0.0	0.16	0.95	0.07	0.0	1.18	1.18	I	3.34	51.43	3.26	54.70
SURBAN *	9.22	I	7.64	18.36	3.36	29.36	I	0.0	0.45	5.28	0.38	0.14	6.24	6.24	I	6.94	51.75	7.92	59.67
NON METRO **	24.18	I	7.58	6.17	0.93	14.68	I	0.13	0.43	1.51	1.99	0.06	4.00	4.13	I	5.15	48.14	9.51	57.65
AVERAGE	22.09	I	5.84	10.74	1.25	17.83	I	0.07	0.44	2.55	1.25	0.06	4.31	4.38	I	9.30	53.59	8.00	61.60

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%
MIDDLE 50%
(* * * PROPERTY VALUE UNAVAILABLE FOR THIS STATE * * *)

AVERAGE

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	29.18	1	0.0	1.49	0.0	1.49	1	1.49	1	1.24	1.41	5.20	1.31	0.29	8.21	9.45	1	7.50	47.62	11.02	58.64
LARGEST CC	45.31	1	0.0	3.81	0.0	3.81	1	1.43	1	1.43	2.35	1.58	1.60	0.0	5.53	6.96	1	10.33	66.41	10.03	76.44
SUBURBAN *	19.44	1	0.0	7.90	3.16	7.90	1	1.73	1	1.73	1.08	3.76	2.08	0.56	7.47	9.20	1	12.31	52.02	10.37	62.39
NON METRO **	59.94	1	0.0	2.59	0.0	2.59	1	2.27	1	2.27	0.83	3.09	1.25	0.34	5.52	7.79	1	7.04	77.36	12.45	89.81
AVERAGE	42.77	1	0.0	3.27	0.60	3.27	1	1.85	1	1.85	1.06	3.87	1.42	0.37	6.71	8.57	1	8.19	63.40	11.61	75.01

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE: U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

[illegible]

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

75

THE

75

75

75

75

75

75

75

76
 1988[illegible][illegible]

	EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA
1970	186.0
1971	186.0
1972	186.0
1973	186.0
1974	186.0
1975	186.0
1976	186.0
1977	186.0
1978	186.0
1979	186.0
1980	186.0
1981	186.0
1982	186.0
1983	186.0
1984	186.0
1985	186.0
1986	186.0
1987	186.0
1988	186.0
1989	186.0
1990	186.0
1991	186.0
1992	186.0
1993	186.0
1994	186.0
1995	186.0
1996	186.0
1997	186.0
1998	186.0
1999	186.0
2000	186.0
2001	186.0
2002	186.0
2003	186.0
2004	186.0
2005	186.0
2006	186.0
2007	186.0
2008	186.0
2009	186.0
2010	186.0
2011	186.0
2012	186.0
2013	186.0
2014	186.0
2015	186.0
2016	186.0
2017	186.0
2018	186.0
2019	186.0
2020	186.0
2021	186.0
2022	186.0
2023	186.0
2024	186.0
2025	186.0
2026	186.0
2027	186.0
2028	186.0
2029	186.0
2030	186.0
2031	186.0
2032	186.0
2033	186.0
2034	186.0
2035	186.0
2036	186.0
2037	186.0
2038	186.0
2039	186.0
2040	186.0
2041	186.0
2042	186.0
2043	186.0
2044	186.0
2045	186.0
2046	186.0
2047	186.0
2048	186.0
2049	186.0
2050	186.0
2051	186.0
2052	186.0
2053	186.0
2054	186.0
2055	186.0
2056	186.0
2057	186.0
2058	186.0
2059	186.0
2060	186.0
2061	186.0
2062	186.0
2063	186.0
2064	186.0
2065	186.0
2066	186.0
2067	186.0
2068	186.0
2069	186.0
2070	186.0
2071	186.0
2072	186.0
2073	186.0
2074	186.0
2075	186.0
2076	186.0
2077	186.0
2078	186.0
2079	186.0
2080	186.0
2081	186.0
2082	186.0
2083	186.0
2084	186.0
2085	186.0
2086	186.0
2087	186.0
2088	186.0
2089	186.0
2090	186.0
2091	186.0
2092	186.0
2093	186.0
2094	186.0
2095	186.0
2096	186.0
2097	186.0
2098	186.0
2099	186.0
2100	186.0

	13.95	1	9.97	10.39	0.0	20.36	1	1.74	0.41	4.01	1.67	0.21	6.29	8.03	1	3.95	46.29	4.70	50.99
LOW 25%	13.95	1	9.97	10.39	0.0	20.36	1	1.74	0.41	4.01	1.67	0.21	6.29	8.03	1	3.95	46.29	4.70	50.99
MIDDLE 50%	15.49	1	0.70	7.84	0.0	8.53	1	2.69	0.71	2.72	2.23	0.15	5.81	8.50	1	3.20	35.73	5.90	41.63
HIGH 25%	9.09	1	0.41	8.95	0.0	9.36	1	2.53	0.49	1.80	1.80	0.08	4.18	6.71	1	2.27	27.44	6.04	33.48
AVERAGE	13.51	1	2.94	8.75	0.0	11.70	1	2.41	0.58	2.81	1.98	0.15	5.52	7.93	1	3.16	36.30	5.63	41.93

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	31.44	1	3.79	9.45	0.0	13.24	1	5.57	0.75	7.06	1.23	0.19	9.23	14.81	1	7.44	66.93	4.96	71.89
LARGEST CC	43.68	1	0.03	6.88	0.0	6.91	1	8.30	1.04	9.13	1.36	0.09	11.62	19.92	1	1.96	72.48	5.58	78.06
SUBURBAN *	7.16	1	0.76	8.72	0.0	9.48	1	1.28	0.52	1.20	1.66	0.13	3.51	4.79	1	1.64	23.07	5.77	28.84
NON METRO **	8.63	1	7.44	8.54	0.0	15.97	1	4.80	0.54	1.96	3.55	0.18	6.24	11.03	1	2.07	37.71	6.13	43.83
AVERAGE	13.09	1	2.83	8.85	0.0	11.68	1	2.99	0.58	2.71	1.95	0.16	5.40	8.39	1	3.07	36.24	5.66	41.89

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

TITLE	I	874A	874B	S A F A	I	IVOC	ED	TITLE	II	III	ESEA	DISCRETIONARY	OTHER	TITLE	V-A	NDEA	TOTAL	ALL	OTHER	TOTAL	FED	EDUC	SCHOOL	LUNCH	TOTAL
ESEA	I																								
	I																								
	I																								
	I																								
	I																								

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	17.93	I	1.69	1.94	2.89	6.51	I	2.98	0.44	1.64	1.09	0.14	3.31	6.29	I	8.38	39.11	6.63	45.74
MIDDLE 50%	19.12	I	0.37	1.04	1.84	3.26	I	2.22	0.85	3.73	0.73	0.33	5.63	7.86	I	12.96	43.19	5.74	48.93
HIGH 25%	4.48	I	0.10	0.71	0.90	1.72	I	2.31	0.31	1.34	1.50	0.39	3.54	5.85	I	1.78	13.82	4.82	18.65
AVERAGE	15.16	I	0.63	1.18	1.87	3.69	I	2.44	0.61	2.61	1.01	0.29	4.53	6.96	I	9.02	34.83	5.73	40.56

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	9.46	I	1.65	1.02	0.78	3.45	I	2.20	0.41	1.25	1.81	0.28	3.75	5.95	I	1.76	20.65	7.00	27.65
MIDDLE 50%	18.38	I	0.44	1.55	2.11	4.10	I	2.05	0.84	3.33	0.68	0.27	5.13	7.18	I	11.34	41.01	5.28	46.29
HIGH 25%	14.39	I	0.0	0.62	2.46	3.08	I	3.44	0.37	2.51	0.88	0.35	4.11	7.55	I	11.63	36.65	5.36	42.01
AVERAGE	15.16	I	0.63	1.18	1.87	3.69	I	2.44	0.61	2.61	1.01	0.29	4.53	6.96	I	9.02	34.83	5.73	40.56

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	32.24	I	0.0	1.66	5.23	6.89	I	2.58	1.40	6.33	0.55	0.51	8.80	11.39	I	25.79	76.31	5.04	82.36
LARGEST CC	39.41	I	0.0	2.91	5.01	7.92	I	1.64	2.23	9.30	0.0	0.58	12.12	13.76	I	32.81	93.90	7.47	101.38
SUBURBAN *	7.55	I	0.41	0.53	0.59	1.53	I	2.14	0.29	1.67	1.27	0.29	3.53	5.67	I	3.44	18.19	5.05	23.25
NON METRO **	14.10	I	1.79	2.12	1.18	5.08	I	2.94	0.48	0.78	0.92	0.08	2.27	5.20	I	3.79	28.17	6.90	35.08
AVERAGE	15.16	I	0.63	1.18	1.87	3.69	I	2.44	0.61	2.61	1.01	0.29	4.53	6.96	I	9.02	34.83	5.73	40.56

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

78

[illegible]

0.0	0.0
0.1	0.1
0.2	0.2
0.3	0.3
0.4	0.4
0.5	0.5
0.6	0.6
0.7	0.7
0.8	0.8
0.9	0.9
1.0	1.0
1.1	1.1
1.2	1.2
1.3	1.3
1.4	1.4
1.5	1.5
1.6	1.6
1.7	1.7
1.8	1.8
1.9	1.9
2.0	2.0
2.1	2.1
2.2	2.2
2.3	2.3
2.4	2.4
2.5	2.5
2.6	2.6
2.7	2.7
2.8	2.8
2.9	2.9
3.0	3.0
3.1	3.1
3.2	3.2
3.3	3.3
3.4	3.4
3.5	3.5
3.6	3.6
3.7	3.7
3.8	3.8
3.9	3.9
4.0	4.0
4.1	4.1
4.2	4.2
4.3	4.3
4.4	4.4
4.5	4.5
4.6	4.6
4.7	4.7
4.8	4.8
4.9	4.9
5.0	5.0
5.1	5.1
5.2	5.2
5.3	5.3
5.4	5.4
5.5	5.5
5.6	5.6
5.7	5.7
5.8	5.8
5.9	5.9
6.0	6.0
6.1	6.1
6.2	6.2
6.3	6.3
6.4	6.4
6.5	6.5
6.6	6.6
6.7	6.7
6.8	6.8
6.9	6.9
7.0	7.0
7.1	7.1
7.2	7.2
7.3	7.3
7.4	7.4
7.5	7.5
7.6	7.6
7.7	7.7
7.8	7.8
7.9	7.9
8.0	8.0
8.1	8.1
8.2	8.2
8.3	8.3
8.4	8.4
8.5	8.5
8.6	8.6
8.7	8.7
8.8	8.8
8.9	8.9
9.0	9.0
9.1	9.1
9.2	9.2
9.3	9.3
9.4	9.4
9.5	9.5
9.6	9.6
9.7	9.7
9.8	9.8
9.9	9.9
10.0	10.0

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

79
 1984

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.83	1.45	1.38	1.23	0.28	4.34	12.16	I	8.54	147.68	24.13	171.80
LOW 25%	126.98	I	0.0	0.0	0.0	I	7.83	1.45	1.38	1.23	0.28	I	8.54	147.68	24.13	171.80
MIDDLE 50%	42.95	I	0.0	3.82	0.24	I	3.75	0.69	2.59	1.77	0.25	I	2.46	58.52	17.30	75.62
HIGH 25%	18.69	I	1.77	6.79	7.94	I	0.97	0.48	1.55	0.49	0.46	I	5.80	44.95	14.78	59.73
AVERAGE	57.89	I	0.44	3.61	2.10	I	4.08	0.83	2.03	1.31	0.31	I	4.82	77.42	18.38	95.79

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	20.05	I	0.09	12.07	0.0	12.17	I	0.58	1.07	0.0	0.83	0.80	2.70	3.28	I	0.0	35.50	13.72	49.22
LARGEST CC	18.81	I	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	I	0.87	0.79	0.0	0.39	0.89	2.07	2.94	I	0.0	21.75	12.77	34.52
SUBURBAN *	29.91	I	0.0	8.75	28.21	36.96	I	1.40	1.44	0.0	2.88	0.49	4.81	6.21	I	15.25	88.32	19.23	107.56
NON METRO **	64.99	I	0.52	2.12	0.14	2.78	I	4.74	0.75	2.45	1.24	0.23	4.67	9.41	I	4.53	81.72	18.88	100.60
AVERAGE	57.89	I	0.44	3.61	2.10	6.16	I	4.08	0.83	2.03	1.31	0.31	4.48	8.56	I	4.82	77.42	18.38	95.79

#INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	29.97	1	8.15	3.93	0.56	12.64	1	12.97	0.89	3.01	1.63	0.29	5.82	18.80	1	10.67	72.07	10.19	82.26
MIDDLE 50%	10.40	1	1.09	9.37	2.33	12.79	1	3.86	1.11	2.44	1.50	0.20	5.25	9.12	1	1.44	33.75	7.48	41.23
HIGH 25%	2.06	1	0.03	6.35	3.18	9.57	1	0.83	0.86	4.29	1.70	0.44	7.28	8.12	1	3.18	22.92	5.50	28.43
AVERAGE	13.21	1	2.59	7.26	2.10	11.95	1	5.38	0.99	3.05	1.58	0.28	5.90	11.29	1	4.18	40.62	7.66	48.29
EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA																			
LOW 25%	13.25	1	10.19	9.65	3.85	23.70	1	5.46	1.03	0.77	1.90	0.22	3.92	9.37	1	5.45	51.78	8.54	60.31
MIDDLE 50%	12.50	1	0.11	5.57	2.16	7.84	1	5.95	0.95	3.53	1.57	0.30	6.36	12.31	1	4.21	36.86	7.58	44.45
HIGH 25%	14.53	1	0.0	8.43	0.27	8.70	1	4.11	1.04	4.43	1.24	0.31	7.02	11.13	1	2.27	36.63	6.95	43.57
AVERAGE	13.19	1	2.60	7.30	2.11	12.02	1	5.37	0.99	3.07	1.57	0.28	5.91	11.20	1	4.04	40.53	7.66	48.20

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	12.69	1	0.10	2.09	0.0	2.19	1	4.32	0.61	3.26	0.93	0.28	5.08	9.41	1	4.09	28.38	7.77	36.15
LARGEST CC	14.23	1	0.20	4.32	0.0	4.53	1	6.03	0.00	0.0	0.34	0.34	0.69	6.72	1	5.03	30.51	8.42	38.93
SUBURBAN *	6.96	1	0.82	9.08	2.90	12.80	1	2.70	1.04	3.02	1.61	0.28	5.95	8.64	1	2.13	30.54	6.81	37.36
NON METRO **	30.16	1	8.16	4.07	0.63	12.85	1	12.96	0.99	3.05	1.73	0.28	6.05	19.01	1	9.73	71.75	9.91	81.67
AVERAGE	13.21	1	2.59	7.26	2.10	11.95	1	5.38	0.99	3.05	1.58	0.28	5.90	11.29	1	4.18	40.62	7.66	48.29

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

81

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	17.13	1	13.54	2.61	7.63	23.78	1	4.47	0.0	0.22	3.10	0.0	3.32	7.79	1	5.42	54.12	9.10	63.23
LOW 25%	17.13	1	13.54	2.61	7.63	23.78	1	4.47	0.0	0.22	3.10	0.0	3.32	7.79	1	5.42	54.12	9.10	63.23
MIDDLE 50%	15.72	1	3.80	3.06	42.15	49.02	1	4.26	0.0	8.30	1.66	0.0	9.96	14.22	1	8.72	87.69	5.51	93.20
HIGH 25%	8.93	1	0.10	8.75	0.69	9.54	1	6.02	0.0	8.97	0.75	0.0	9.72	15.74	1	13.83	48.04	1.47	49.52
AVERAGE	14.38	1	5.31	4.37	23.16	32.84	1	4.75	0.0	6.45	1.79	0.0	8.24	12.99	1	9.17	69.38	5.40	74.78

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

[illegible]

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

TITLE	I	874A	874B	S A F A	OTHER	TOTAL	I	IVOC	ED	TITLE	ED	TITLE	ED	STATE	DISCRETIONARY	TITLE	ED	TITLE	ED	TOTAL	ED	ALL	OTHER	TOTAL	SCHOOL	LUNCH	TOTAL	FED	EDUC	PLUS	SCHOOL	LUNCH
ESEA	I						I															I										
	I						I															I										
	I						I															I										
	I						I															I										
	I						I															I										

63 29

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	26.82	I	0.31	3.81	0.29	4.41	I	1.59	0.50	0.28	0.52	0.30	1.61	3.20	I	1.59	36.02	9.65	45.67
MIDDLE 50%	12.03	I	0.20	6.80	0.0	7.00	I	2.98	0.28	0.21	0.80	0.21	1.50	4.48	I	0.79	24.31	3.46	27.76
HIGH 25%	6.32	I	26.52	21.14	0.0	47.67	I	2.80	0.70	1.36	1.53	0.52	4.11	6.91	I	17.02	77.92	2.59	80.51
AVERAGE	14.30	I	6.81	9.64	0.07	16.52	I	2.59	0.44	0.52	0.91	0.31	2.18	4.77	I	5.04	40.64	4.79	45.43

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	20.97	I	26.83	15.74	0.0	42.56	I	1.65	0.61	0.13	0.71	0.45	1.89	3.54	I	0.50	67.58	6.95	74.53
MIDDLE 50%	9.36	I	0.21	9.68	0.13	10.01	I	2.98	0.34	0.74	1.18	0.18	2.44	5.42	I	9.13	33.93	2.26	36.19
HIGH 25%	17.51	I	0.0	3.47	0.03	3.49	I	2.74	0.48	0.46	0.58	0.43	1.96	4.70	I	1.42	27.13	7.69	34.81
AVERAGE	14.30	I	6.81	9.64	0.07	16.52	I	2.59	0.44	0.52	0.91	0.31	2.18	4.77	I	5.04	40.64	4.79	45.43

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	3.63	I	0.0	10.88	0.0	10.88	I	3.57	0.31	0.85	0.78	0.19	2.13	5.70	I	13.17	33.38	0.20	33.58
LARGEST CC	0.0	I	0.0	11.22	0.0	11.22	I	4.96	0.0	0.0	0.47	0.0	0.47	5.43	I	0.58	17.24	0.0	17.24
SUBURBAN *	5.06	I	45.59	27.29	0.0	72.88	I	3.63	0.53	0.46	1.55	0.50	3.04	6.67	I	0.97	85.57	5.49	91.06
NON METRO **	23.28	I	0.33	4.06	0.14	4.54	I	1.71	0.49	0.33	0.82	0.34	1.98	3.69	I	1.24	32.75	7.38	40.13
AVERAGE	14.30	I	6.81	9.64	0.07	16.52	I	2.59	0.44	0.52	0.91	0.31	2.18	4.77	I	5.04	40.64	4.79	45.43

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.
**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.
SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

1. -CIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	5.07	1	2.47	9.55	0.0	12.03	1	4.90	0.78	1.69	0.18	0.14	2.79	7.70	1	12.65	37.44	4.72	42.16
LARGEST CC	5.07	1	2.47	9.55	0.0	12.03	1	4.90	0.78	1.69	0.18	0.14	2.79	7.70	1	12.65	37.44	4.72	42.16
SUBURBAN *	4.95	1	7.81	26.41	16.68	50.91	1	1.72	0.78	2.01	0.88	0.72	4.39	6.11	1	16.89	78.86	2.24	81.10
NON METRO **	8.47	1	21.45	16.25	2.58	40.29	1	6.50	0.63	14.07	1.05	0.86	16.61	23.11	1	16.27	88.14	6.29	94.43
AVERAGE	5.69	1	9.38	20.57	10.08	40.03	1	3.40	0.75	4.38	0.75	0.62	6.50	9.91	1	15.81	71.44	3.62	75.06

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

*****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

84

SECRET

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99

AVERAGE	8.22	1	4.66	10.13	0.0	14.79	1	1.26	0.69	2.08	0.92	0.23	3.93	5.19	1	3.45	31.65	8.04	39.68
---------	------	---	------	-------	-----	-------	---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	---	------	-------	------	-------

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

AVERAGE	8.26	I	4.69	10.09	0.0	14.79	I	1.26	0.70	0.65	0.93	0.23	2.51	3.77	I	3.47	30.29	8.04	38.33
---------	------	---	------	-------	-----	-------	---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	---	------	-------	------	-------

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

[illegible]

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

85

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

86

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA[illegible]

AVERAGE

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.
**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

87
[REDACTED]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

[illegible]

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

88

[illegible]

01	01
02	02
03	03
04	04
05	05
06	06
07	07
08	08
09	09
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99
100	100

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED);

89

[illegible]

	30.50	1	3.87	1.59	0.0	5.46	1	5.26	0.11	4.07	0.38	0.04	4.60	9.85	1	12.49	58.30	6.47	64.77
LOW 25%	30.50	1	3.87	1.59	0.0	5.46	1	5.26	0.11	4.07	0.38	0.04	4.60	9.85	1	12.49	58.30	6.47	64.77
MIDDLE 50%	14.51	1	21.26	3.60	0.90	25.77	1	7.86	0.06	1.53	0.41	0.02	2.02	9.88	1	6.35	56.51	3.03	59.54
HIGH 25%	6.26	1	35.83	6.06	0.0	41.89	1	13.51	0.0	0.42	0.71	0.05	1.18	14.69	1	4.72	67.55	6.32	73.87
AVERAGE	16.44	1	20.56	3.71	0.45	24.72	1	8.62	0.06	1.89	0.48	0.03	2.45	11.08	1	7.48	59.72	4.71	64.43

	8.43	I	80.08	11.17	0.0	91.25	I	8.34	0.02	0.0	0.11	0.02	0.16	8.50	I	7.09	115.28	3.33	118.61
LOW 25%	.14-27	I	0.03	0.68	0.90	1.62	I	9.79	0.05	3.78	0.76	0.03	4.62	14.41	I	5.54	35.84	5.43	41.27
MIDDLE 50%	28.81	I	2.07	2.32	0.0	4.39	I	6.57	0.11	0.0	0.26	0.04	0.41	6.98	I	11.74	51.93	4.66	56.59
HIGH 25%																			
AVERAGE	16.44	I	20.56	3.71	0.45	24.72	I	8.62	0.06	1.89	0.48	0.03	2.45	11.08	I	7.48	59.72	4.71	64.43

CENTER CITY	6.11	I	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.04	0.04	1.09	17.13	I	8.24	31.48	5.89	37.38
LARGEST CC	6.11	I	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.04	0.04	1.09	17.13	I	8.24	31.48	5.89	37.38
SUBURBAN *	14.27	I	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.12	0.22	0.01	0.36	8.56	I	0.0	22.83	1.59	24.43
NON METRO **	17.60	I	23.44	4.23	0.51	28.18	I	7.86	0.06	2.15	2.67	10.53	I	7.66	63.98	4.70	68.68
AVERAGE	16.44	I	20.56	3.71	0.45	24.72	I	8.62	0.06	1.89	2.45	11.08	I	7.48	59.72	4.71	64.43

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

20

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

***INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

91.

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.
**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

93

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

94

0	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
13	0
14	0
15	0
16	0
17	0
18	0
19	0
20	0
21	0
22	0
23	0
24	0
25	0
26	0
27	0
28	0
29	0
30	0
31	0
32	0
33	0
34	0
35	0
36	0
37	0
38	0
39	0
40	0
41	0
42	0
43	0
44	0
45	0
46	0
47	0
48	0
49	0
50	0
51	0
52	0
53	0
54	0
55	0
56	0
57	0
58	0
59	0
60	0
61	0
62	0
63	0
64	0
65	0
66	0
67	0
68	0
69	0
70	0
71	0
72	0
73	0
74	0
75	0
76	0
77	0
78	0
79	0
80	0
81	0
82	0
83	0
84	0
85	0
86	0
87	0
88	0
89	0
90	0
91	0
92	0
93	0
94	0
95	0
96	0
97	0
98	0
99	0

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

95

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

[illegible]

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	24.68	I	0.0	1.23	0.0	1.23	I	1.23	I	2.12	0.43	1.08	0.65	0.22	2.39	4.51	I	2.24	32.65	14.54	47.19
LARGEST CC	24.68	I	0.0	1.23	0.0	1.23	I	1.23	I	2.12	0.43	1.08	0.65	0.22	2.39	4.51	I	2.24	32.65	14.54	47.19
SUBURBAN *	35.16	I	0.01	16.82	3.10	19.93	I	2.47	I	1.13	1.96	1.74	0.22	5.05	7.52	I	7.54	70.15	8.33	78.48	
NON METRO **	63.26	I	0.92	3.13	0.52	4.58	I	4.19	I	1.60	3.66	0.71	0.27	6.24	10.43	I	8.20	86.46	14.46	100.92	
AVERAGE	51.86	I	0.58	6.90	1.22	8.70	I	3.52	I	1.36	2.95	1.00	0.25	5.57	9.38	I	7.50	77.14	12.70	89.84	

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

96

[illegible]

	49.26	1	24.77	4.70	1.35	30.82	1	2.85	0.50	0.41	1.06	0.0	1.96	4.82	1	27.96	112.86	9.88	122.74
LOW 25%	49.26	1	24.77	4.70	1.35	30.82	1	2.85	0.50	0.41	1.06	0.0	1.96	4.82	1	27.96	112.86	9.88	122.74
MIDDLE 50%	29.89	1	12.68	6.03	6.89	25.60	1	4.75	0.72	0.80	2.03	0.02	3.57	8.32	1	2.88	66.69	7.26	73.96
HIGH 25%	20.01	1	0.53	8.60	0.0	9.13	1	4.79	0.78	0.57	1.24	0.0	2.59	7.38	1	3.84	40.36	3.30	43.67
AVERAGE	32.26	1	12.67	6.34	3.78	22.79	1	4.29	0.68	0.65	1.59	0.01	2.92	7.21	1	9.39	71.65	6.93	78.58

[illegible]

	CENTER CITY	LARGEST CC	SUBURBAN *	NON METRO **	AVERAGE
1980-81	19.06	19.06	15.04	34.34	32.26
1981-82	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 0.0	I 14.58	I 12.67
1982-83	6.65	6.65	0.0	6.44	6.34
1983-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.35	3.78
1984-85	6.65	6.65	0.0	25.37	22.79
1985-86	I 5.28	I 5.28	I 3.50	I 4.17	I 4.29
1986-87	0.89	0.89	0.48	0.66	0.68
1987-88	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.74	0.65
1988-89	1.78	1.78	0.24	1.59	1.59
1989-90	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.01	0.01
1990-91	2.67	2.67	0.72	3.00	2.92
1991-92	I 7.96	I 7.96	I 4.22	I 7.18	I 7.21
1992-93	5.49	5.49	0.11	I 10.10	I 9.39
1993-94	39.15	39.15	19.37	77.00	71.65
1994-95	0.0	0.0	8.81	7.78	6.93
1995-96	39.15	39.15	28.18	84.78	78.58

0.0	0.0
0.1	0.1
0.2	0.2
0.3	0.3
0.4	0.4
0.5	0.5
0.6	0.6
0.7	0.7
0.8	0.8
0.9	0.9
1.0	1.0
1.1	1.1
1.2	1.2
1.3	1.3
1.4	1.4
1.5	1.5
1.6	1.6
1.7	1.7
1.8	1.8
1.9	1.9
2.0	2.0
2.1	2.1
2.2	2.2
2.3	2.3
2.4	2.4
2.5	2.5
2.6	2.6
2.7	2.7
2.8	2.8
2.9	2.9
3.0	3.0
3.1	3.1
3.2	3.2
3.3	3.3
3.4	3.4
3.5	3.5
3.6	3.6
3.7	3.7
3.8	3.8
3.9	3.9
4.0	4.0
4.1	4.1
4.2	4.2
4.3	4.3
4.4	4.4
4.5	4.5
4.6	4.6
4.7	4.7
4.8	4.8
4.9	4.9
5.0	5.0
5.1	5.1
5.2	5.2
5.3	5.3
5.4	5.4
5.5	5.5
5.6	5.6
5.7	5.7
5.8	5.8
5.9	5.9
6.0	6.0
6.1	6.1
6.2	6.2
6.3	6.3
6.4	6.4
6.5	6.5
6.6	6.6
6.7	6.7
6.8	6.8
6.9	6.9
7.0	7.0
7.1	7.1
7.2	7.2
7.3	7.3
7.4	7.4
7.5	7.5
7.6	7.6
7.7	7.7
7.8	7.8
7.9	7.9
8.0	8.0
8.1	8.1
8.2	8.2
8.3	8.3
8.4	8.4
8.5	8.5
8.6	8.6
8.7	8.7
8.8	8.8
8.9	8.9
9.0	9.0
9.1	9.1
9.2	9.2
9.3	9.3
9.4	9.4
9.5	9.5
9.6	9.6
9.7	9.7
9.8	9.8
9.9	9.9
10.0	10.0

****INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

97

00	00
01	01
02	02
03	03
04	04
05	05
06	06
07	07
08	08
09	09
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99

	60.54	I	0.0	2.08	0.0	2.08	I	4.66	0.75	0.0	0.94	0.02	1.70	6.36	I	15.97	84.96	17.95	102.91
LOW 25%	60.54	I	0.0	2.08	0.0	2.08	I	4.66	0.75	0.0	0.94	0.02	1.70	6.36	I	15.97	84.96	17.95	102.91
MIDDLE 50%	30.50	I	0.52	8.20	0.0	8.72	I	5.16	0.78	0.0	1.40	0.01	2.18	7.35	I	12.41	58.98	10.60	69.58
HIGH 25%	18.36	I	0.0	5.34	0.0	5.34	I	4.36	0.80	0.0	1.34	0.02	2.16	6.52	I	9.51	39.73	7.14	46.87
AVERAGE	34.93	I	0.26	5.96	0.0	6.21	I	4.84	0.78	0.0	1.27	0.01	2.06	6.89	I	12.58	60.66	11.58	72.24

	1	0.0	4.57	0.0	4.57	I	3.82	0.77	0.0	1.18	0.0	1.95	5.78	I	13.45	69.39	14.20	83.59	
LOW 25%	45.60	I	0.0	4.57	0.0	4.57	I	3.82	0.77	0.0	1.18	0.0	1.95	5.78	I	13.45	69.39	14.20	83.59
MIDDLE 50%	33.40	I	0.52	5.62	0.0	6.14	I	6.45	0.74	0.0	1.40	0.01	2.15	8.60	I	16.30	64.44	10.58	75.02
HIGH 25%	27.50	I	0.0	9.01	0.0	8.01	I	2.63	0.86	0.0	1.10	0.02	1.97	4.60	I	4.25	44.36	10.94	55.31
AVERAGE:	34.98	I	0.26	5.96	0.0	6.21	I	4.84	0.78	0.0	1.27	0.01	2.06	6.89	I	12.58	60.66	11.58	72.24

[illegible]

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

98

[illegible]

—

HIGH 25%

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

29

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	13.46	1	1.59	9.14	0.0	10.73	1	1.42	0.84	8.05	0.90	0.05	9.83	11.25	1	16.16	51.60	14.37	65.97
LOW 25%	13.46	1	1.59	9.14	0.0	10.73	1	1.42	0.84	8.05	0.90	0.05	9.83	11.25	1	16.16	51.60	14.37	65.97
MIDDLE 50%	9.30	1	0.19	17.37	0.0	17.56	1	0.98	0.53	1.42	0.64	0.06	2.65	3.63	1	8.92	39.42	9.61	49.03
HIGH 25%	4.22	1	4.58	39.29	0.0	43.87	1	0.51	0.88	0.03	0.45	0.27	1.63	2.14	1	1.95	52.18	11.33	63.51
AVERAGE	9.07	1	1.64	20.79	0.0	22.43	1	0.97	0.69	2.73	0.66	0.11	4.19	5.16	1	8.99	45.65	11.23	56.89
EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA																			
LOW 25%	5.38	1	4.58	44.37	0.0	48.96	1	0.52	1.13	1.10	0.52	0.26	3.01	3.53	1	5.31	63.18	11.13	74.32
MIDDLE 50%	8.55	1	0.22	14.48	0.0	14.70	1	0.78	0.46	2.87	0.77	0.08	4.18	4.96	1	9.92	38.14	12.83	50.97
HIGH 25%	13.82	1	1.52	9.84	0.0	11.35	1	1.81	0.72	4.08	0.57	0.02	5.39	7.20	1	10.79	43.16	8.12	51.28
AVERAGE	9.07	1	1.64	20.79	0.0	22.43	1	0.97	0.69	2.73	0.66	0.11	4.19	5.16	1	8.99	45.65	11.23	56.89

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

	15.62	I	0.0	18.67	0.0	18.67	I	1.35	0.78	3.98	0.75	0.03	5.55	6.89	I	20.18	61.36	8.17	69.53
CENTER CITY	15.62	I	0.0	18.67	0.0	18.67	I	1.35	0.78	3.98	0.75	0.03	5.55	6.89	I	20.18	61.36	8.17	69.53
LARGEST CC	17.03	I	0.0	9.90	0.0	9.90	I	2.03	0.71	4.59	0.57	0.0	5.88	7.91	I	13.29	48.12	4.73	52.85
SUBURBAN *	5.07	I	2.02	21.55	0.0	23.57	I	0.53	0.61	1.03	0.54	0.16	2.34	2.87	I	2.89	34.40	10.84	45.24
NON METRO **	13.33	I	2.08	20.73	0.0	22.81	I	1.73	0.81	5.81	0.88	0.05	7.55	9.28	I	14.42	59.84	14.74	74.58
AVERAGE	9.07	I	1.64	20.79	0.0	22.43	I	0.97	0.69	2.73	0.66	0.11	4.19	5.16	I	8.99	45.65	11.23	56.89

#INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

#INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

100

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADADEGREE OF URBANIZATION

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

101

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

	1	0.0	2.06	0.0	2.06	I	15.40	0.29	4.14	1.41	0.36	6.20	21.60	I	8.91	'91.80	15.61	107.40
LOW 25%	59.23	I	0.0	2.06	0.0	2.06	I	15.40	0.29	4.14	1.41	0.36	6.20	21.60	I	8.91	15.61	107.40
MIDDLE 50%	28.75	I	0.00	22.80	3.19	26.00	I	0.13	0.16	2.06	0.85	0.09	3.16	3.29	I	6.34	11.78	76.16
HIGH 25%	6.73	I	0.38	21.98	1.67	24.04	I	1.91	0.10	2.44	0.82	0.06	3.44	5.35	I	3.46	8.05	47.63
AVERAGE	30.86	I	0.10	17.41	2.01	19.52	I	4.39	0.18	2.68	0.98	0.15	3.99	8.38	I	6.27	11.80	76.84

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	31.76	I	0.01	29.36	4.04	33.41	I	1.10	0.14	2.49	0.81	0.18	3.62	4.72	I	9.95	79.84	11.63	91.47
LARGEST CC	49.39	I	0.0	46.46	0.0	46.46	I	0.0	0.0	2.63	0.92	0.0	3.55	3.55	I	20.63	120.04	15.64	135.68
SUBURBAN *	13.78	I	0.38	36.09	3.38	39.85	I	1.00	0.18	3.45	1.15	0.05	4.84	5.85	I	3.82	63.30	8.98	72.28
NON METRO **	38.63	I	0.0	3.37	0.49	3.86	I	7.42	0.20	2.38	0.98	0.18	3.74	11.16	I	5.85	59.51	13.23	72.73
AVERAGE	30.86	I	0.10	17.41	2.01	19.52	I	4.39	0.18	2.68	0.98	0.15	3.99	8.38	I	6.27	65.03	11.80	76.84

***INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.**

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE: U.S. CENSUS-EL SEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

TITLE	I	874A	874B	S	A	F	A	OTHER	TOTAL	IVOC	ED	TITLE	II	III	ESEA	STATE	DISCRETIONARY	TITLE	IV	ED	TOTAL	ALL	OTHER	TOTAL	SCHOOL	FED	EDUC	TOTAL	
ESEA	I																												
	I																												
	I																												
	I																												
	I																												

102

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	19.06	I	6.95	13.47	1.74	22.16	I	2.24	1.25	1.50	0.0	0.57	3.32	5.55	I	36.65	83.43	7.87	91.30
MIDDLE 50%	11.34	I	0.94	11.01	0.07	12.02	I	2.61	1.18	1.73	0.0	0.76	3.67	6.27	I	24.97	54.61	5.67	60.29
HIGH 25%	3.72	I	0.12	7.89	21.20	29.21	I	1.99	2.50	2.27	0.0	1.68	6.45	8.43	I	12.00	53.36	4.95	58.31
AVERAGE	11.37	I	2.24	10.85	5.77	18.86	I	2.36	1.52	1.81	0.0	0.94	4.27	6.63	I	24.65	61.50	6.04	67.55

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA

LOW 25%	6.93	I	0.60	14.89	22.13	37.63	I	2.36	1.29	0.92	0.0	0.94	3.15	5.51	I	28.11	78.19	5.40	83.59
MIDDLE 50%	12.38	I	2.72	11.18	0.0	13.91	I	2.59	1.87	2.16	0.0	1.04	5.07	7.66	I	23.55	57.49	6.63	64.12
HIGH 25%	13.78	I	2.90	6.13	0.95	9.98	I	1.91	1.07	2.00	0.0	0.75	3.79	5.70	I	23.38	52.84	5.51	58.35
AVERAGE	11.37	I	2.24	10.85	5.77	18.86	I	2.36	1.52	1.81	0.0	0.94	4.27	6.63	I	24.65	61.50	6.04	67.55

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

CENTER CITY	15.77	I	0.21	9.21	0.0	9.42	I	3.00	1.17	2.26	0.0	0.65	4.08	7.07	I	29.65	61.91	6.38	68.29
LARGEST CC	14.95	I	0.39	6.14	0.0	6.53	I	1.61	0.43	3.38	0.0	0.22	4.04	5.65	I	29.55	56.68	5.61	62.29
SUBURBAN *	5.64	I	0.37	8.00	0.44	8.82	I	2.11	2.00	1.72	0.0	1.23	4.95	7.06	I	16.66	38.18	5.21	43.38
NON METRO **	16.11	I	5.96	15.61	16.41	37.98	I	2.28	1.13	1.65	0.0	0.74	3.52	5.80	I	31.97	91.86	6.92	98.78
AVERAGE	11.37	I	2.24	10.85	5.77	18.86	I	2.36	1.52	1.81	0.0	0.94	4.27	6.63	I	24.65	61.50	6.04	67.55

*INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

**INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE. U.S. CENSUS-ELSEGIS 1970 DATA BASE (SUPPLEMENTED).

[illegible]

	1	0.05	2.23	0.0	2.28	I	35.13	0.36	0.0	1.45	0.06	1.87	37.00	I	23.35	131.99	20.63	152.63	
LOW 25%	69.36	I	0.05	2.23	0.0	2.28	I	35.13	0.36	0.0	1.45	0.06	1.87	37.00	I	23.35	131.99	20.63	152.63
MIDDLE 50%	38.49	I	0.0	1.79	0.0	1.79	I	9.02	0.29	1.26	1.45	0.11	3.12	12.14	I	12.15	64.56	15.30	79.86
HIGH 25%	20.06	I	0.0	1.74	0.0	1.74	I	4.63	0.11	6.66	1.52	0.21	8.50	13.12	I	11.39	46.32	20.76	67.08
AVERAGE	41.60	I	0.01	1.89	0.0	1.90	I	14.45	0.27	2.29	1.47	0.12	4.15	18.60	I	14.76	76.86	18.00	94.86

	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.07	0.18	0.46	1.15	0.09	1.88	12.23	I	18.04	99.34	19.64	118.98
LOW 25%	69.08	I	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	I	10.34	0.18	0.09	1.88	12.23	I	18.04	99.34	19.64	118.98
MIDDLE 50%	36.95	I	0.02	3.04	0.0	0.0	0.41	I	20.95	0.41	0.13	3.81	24.77	I	14.46	79.25	18.57	97.82
HIGH 25%	23.41	I	0.0	1.46	0.0	0.0	0.07	I	5.56	0.07	0.14	7.08	12.64	I	12.07	49.59	15.21	64.80
AVERAGE	41.60	I	0.01	1.89	0.0	0.0	0.27	I	14.45	0.27	0.12	4.15	18.60	I	14.76	76.86	18.00	94.86

	1	0.0	1.77	0.0	1.77	1	5.58	0.15	0.0	2.60	0.04	2.78	8.37	1	7.40	36.18	17.37	53.55	
CENTER CITY	18.64	1	0.0	1.77	0.0	1.77	1	5.58	0.15	0.0	2.60	0.04	2.78	8.37	1	7.40	36.18	17.37	53.55
LARGEST CC	22.07	1	0.0	3.37	0.0	3.37	1	6.45	0.05	0.0	2.53	0.0	2.58	9.03	1	10.34	44.81	13.58	58.39
SUBURBAN *	26.63	1	0.0	1.14	0.0	1.14	1	6.30	0.16	7.66	1.26	0.25	9.34	15.64	1	15.47	58.88	12.95	71.83
NOW METRO **	48.97	1	0.02	2.11	0.0	2.13	1	17.94	0.31	1.15	1.36	0.10	2.92	20.87	1	15.61	87.57	19.47	107.04
AVERAGE	41.60	1	0.01	1.89	0.0	1.90	1	14.45	0.27	2.29	1.47	0.12	4.15	18.60	1	14.76	76.86	18.00	94.86

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

WISCONSIN.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (DOLLARS PER PUPIL)

[illegible]

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF DISTRICT

LOW 25%	20.71	1	0.22	3.11	0.05	3.38	1	3.45	1.30	0.54	1.89	0.26	4.00	7.45	1	2.05	33.59	9.98	43.58
MIDDLE 50%	15.48	1	0.01	1.25	0.18	1.44	1	2.42	1.25	2.48	1.77	0.36	5.85	8.28	1	5.41	30.60	5.97	36.58
HIGH 25%	4.49	1	0.0	0.88	0.0	0.88	1	2.97	0.68	1.69	1.68	0.40	4.45	7.42	1	1.22	14.62	6.08	20.10
AVERAGE	14.04	1	0.06	1.62	0.10	1.78	1	2.81	1.12	1.80	1.78	0.35	5.04	7.86	1	3.52	27.20	7.00	34.21

EQUALIZED PROPERTY VALUE PER ADA[illegible]

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

	20.04	I	0.02	2.00	0.0	2.02	I	2.33	1.32	4.88	1.66	0.35	8.21	10.54	I	9.17	41.77	5.00	46.77
CENTER CITY	20.04	I	0.02	2.00	0.0	2.02	I	2.33	1.32	4.88	1.66	0.35	8.21	10.54	I	9.17	41.77	5.00	46.77
LARGEST CC	29.08	I	0.04	2.06	0.0	2.11	I	2.24	1.47	4.58	2.10	0.31	8.46	10.70	I	12.86	54.75	5.75	60.50
SUBURBAN *	5.77	I	0.0	0.16	0.07	0.23	I	2.66	0.83	0.39	1.47	0.38	3.06	5.72	I	1.23	12.95	6.63	19.59
ALL METRO **	16.33	I	0.14	2.54	0.20	2.89	I	3.31	1.21	0.63	2.12	0.31	4.28	7.59	I	1.16	27.97	8.82	36.79
ALL	14.04	I	0.06	1.62	0.10	1.78	I	2.81	1.12	1.80	1.78	0.35	5.04	7.86	I	3.52	27.20	7.00	34.21

INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.

##INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.

SOURCE: U.S. CENSUS-BUREAU OF ECONOMIC ANALYSIS (SUPPLEMENTAL)

[illegible][illegible]

LOW 25%
MIDDLE 50%
HIGH 25%
(** * PROPERTY VALUE UNAVAILABLE FOR THIS STATE ** *)

DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

[illegible]

* INCLUDES ALL NON-CENTER-CITY METROPOLITAN AREAS.
 ** INCLUDES RURAL AND ALL OTHER NON METROPOLITAN AREAS.